UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

MARINE PROTECTED AREAS FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 2006

+ + + + +

NEWPORT, OREGON

+ + + + +

+ + + + +

The Committee met at Oregon Coast Aquarium, located at 2820 S.E. Ferry Slip Road, at 8:00 a.m., Dr. Daniel Bromley, Chair, presiding.

NEAL R. GROSS

APPEARANCES:

Ms. Lauren Wenzel, Designated Federal Official

MARINE PROTECTED AREAS FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

- Dr. Daniel Bromley, Chair, University of Wisconsin
- Dr. Tundi Agardy, Sound Seas
- Mr. Charles D. Beeker, Indiana University
- Mr. Robert Bendick, Jr., The Nature Conservancy
- Dr. Anthony Chatwin, The Nature Conservancy
- Dr. Michael Cruickshank, Marine Minerals Technology

Center Associates

- Ms. Ellen Goethel, Fishing and Ocean Education
- Dr. John Halsey, Michigan Department of State
- Dr. Dennis Heinemann, The Ocean Conservancy
- Dr. Mark Hixon, Oregon State University
- Mr. George Lapointe, Maine Department of Marine Resources
- Dr. Steven Murray, California State University
- Dr. John Ogden, Florida Institute of Oceanography,

University of South Florida

- Mr. Lelei Peau, American Samoa Department of Commerce
- Mr. R. Max Peterson, International Association of

Fish and Wildlife Agencies (Retired)

- Mr. Gilbert Radonski, Sport Fishing Institute (Retired)
- Dr. James P. Ray, Oceanic Environmental Solutions,

LLC

- Dr. Daniel Suman, University of Miami
- Mr. Robert Zales, II, Recreational Fishing

NATIONAL MARINE PROTECTED AREAS CENTER:

NEAL R. GROSS

Mr. Joseph A. Uravitch

Mr. Jonathan Kelsey

Mr. Charlie Wahle

EX-OFFICIO FEDERAL REPRESENTATIVES:

Ms. Mary M. Glackin, Department of Commerce

Mr. Randal Bowman, Department of the Interior Designee

Dr. Brian Melzian, Environmental Protection Agency

A-G-E-N-D-A

		PAGE
I.	Call to Order	4
II.	Panel: MPAs in Oregon	
	Jessica HamiltonJim GoodScott McMullen	7 19 35
	Question/Answer Session	45
III.	Tribal MPA Policies in the Pacific Northwest	
	Jim Woods Dave Hatch	81 97
	Question/Answer Session	118
IV.	MPA Lessons Learned from Australia and New Zealand	
	Daniel Bromley	143
V.	Subcommittee Reports and Committee Feedback	179

NEAL R. GROSS

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	(8:00 a.m.)
3	CHAIR BROMLEY: Let's get started.
4	I'm going to turn it over to Mark Hixon, who
5	will introduce our panelists.
6	Mark, are you going to come up here,
7	or are you going to stay there?
8	DR. HIXON: Actually, I'm going to
9	have the panelists come up and
10	CHAIR BROMLEY: Well, we're ready for
11	that, so
12	DR. HIXON: Could the panelists join
13	me up here, please?
14	Good morning, everyone. Thanks for
15	coming so incredibly bright and early. This is
16	to I guess this is the Fed's desire to impress
17	everybody, that we get up early and get to work.
18	I very much appreciate the panelists coming so
19	early for this meeting.
20	When the Federal Advisory Committee
21	meets in various parts of the country, we always
22	typically have a panel from that particular state

or territory, so that the Committee can learn about local and regional processes, and so that's why this panel was convened.

In our packets, there are brief biosketches of each of the panelists, so I won't have to go on and on about them. They're all very well qualified and operate at the highest levels within the State of Oregon. So we have three panelists today. We'll start with Jessica Hamilton, who will give introduction to initiatives coming out of the office regarding Oregon Governor's protected areas. Then, Jim Good will speak to us about basically a history of the MPA process in Oregon. And then, Scott McMullen I understand will finish up with a fishing community perspective on the process. Is that accurate enough?

Okay. So we'll start with Jessica.

Jessica is the Natural Resource Policy Advisor
for the Governor of Oregon. She has done a variety
of things, which you'll read in the biosketches.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 She has been in her present position most of this year. So we'll start with Jessica. 2 MS. HAMILTON: Good. And I have the 3 pleasure of being here with one of my professors, 4 so this is -- and then Jim also, so --5 (Laughter.) 6 -- I'm kind of sandwiched between my 7 two professors. 8 DR. HIXON: It's a small stage. 9 10 (Laughter.) It is, it is, it is. MS. HAMILTON: 11 So thanks for having us. It's a real pleasure 12 13 for us to be here. We had a pretty big meeting yesterday of the Ocean Policy Advisory Council. 14 15 And many of you have had a chance to meet probably down in California at different conferences, so 16 it's good to have you guys up in Oregon. 17 My role with the Governor's office 18 19 is a Natural Resources Policy Advisor. Many of you had a chance to meet my boss last night, Mike 20 Carrier. And he is the Director of the Natural 21

Resources office for the Governor. The Governor

has a variety of different advisors.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Natural resources is a key area for him, and within that department there are four underneath Mike. staff So we have sustainability coordinator, we have two folks that work on rivering and salmon issues and dam issues in the Klamath Basin for example, and then my role is about 50 percent on ocean. So I think that is symbolic of the Governor's commitment to this area, and then I also work on national forest roadless area conservation. If anybody has been following that debate, it's a hot one out in Oregon.

And then, during the legislative session, I will also serve as a coordinator for the natural resource agencies. We meet every other year in Oregon, and so that will be certainly a challenge working with all of the state agencies to work on their budgets. So I just wanted to kind of give you a background on what my role is.

And in terms of ocean issues, I'm

NEAL R. GROSS

going to run through some of the ones that are tied specifically to MPAs, but I also wanted to highlight my recent role for the Governor has been working on addressing the restrictions in the commercial salmon fishing off the coast of Oregon.

And through that unfortunate process, we have developed really strong relationships with California's Governor in terms of meeting with Lautenbacher, meeting with Hobarth on several occasions to really talk about how we can obtain federal resources for the community that has been affected by these salmon closures. So that's one of the areas.

So we'll go ahead and go to Joe. I think you have to smack it a couple of times. Yes, there you go.

And so just to kind of -- you guys will hopefully get a chance to look at above the water. This is just -- kind of depicts some of the key areas underneath the water off our coast.

And you can go ahead and go to the next one.

NEAL R. GROSS

And then, of course, our marine life, both -- both human, of course, and animals and plants. And so Governor Kulongoski has really embraced ocean protection following the production of the two major Commission reports, the Key Commission and the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy.

And he certainly agrees with the U.S. Commission that marine ecosystems and economies are threatened by the effects of human use, including climate change, and that Oregon is not immune from these effects. And whereas Oregon is healthier than many parts of the country that does not mean that we can't address things that are considered problems off the coast and then also apply the precautionary principle out here.

So, but we also understand that Oregon has a limited jurisdiction and capacity to address the size and complexity of these issues off our coast. And then, we also believe that our new state-federal partnership and ecosystem-based management are important in

NEAL R. GROSS

order to achieve our objective here in Oregon.

So basically the Governor operates under the concept of ecosystem-based management, so he definitely embraces that -- that link between all uses of the ocean. And there are three main areas that I'd like to highlight right now -- his endorsement of the marine reserves proposal that our previous Governor had launched with the -- underneath the advisement of Ocean Policy Advisory Council, proposing a national marine sanctuary in Oregon, and then the West Coast Governor's Agreement on Ocean Health, which was rolled out recently.

And maybe I should back up real quick, and I know these gentlemen are going to talk a little bit more about OPAC's role. But basically, the Governor -- it's according to statute that the Governor has an advisory body, so the Ocean Policy Advisory Council is made up of stakeholder groups.

And so the Governor will ask OPAC to provide him with feedback on certain proposals

NEAL R. GROSS

that he would like to move forward. And then, on occasion OPAC will also bring up issues that they would like to advise the Governor on, so just to kind of give you a sense. But for this first topic, marine reserves — and the next slide actually gives you a little bit more of the history of where that came about, but I'll go ahead and tell you that now.

In 2002, OPAC -- the stakeholder group -- made a recommendation, and Governor Kitzhaber endorsed it -- that we establish a limited system of marine reserves off the coast of Oregon. And the objectives -- actually, if you could go back -- the objectives are to establish ecological reference areas, test the effectiveness of maintaining and restoring ecological integrity, and provide a framework for research funding, and then, of course, increase public understanding and awareness. I'm going to give you a little background on that.

And so Governor Kulongoski in 2005 asked the existing -- the new OPAC, we've had

NEAL R. GROSS

some changes -- the new OPAC to go ahead and implement that 2002 recommendation, and so there is currently a working group that is working on, what does that mean?

So the second topic is the National Marine Sanctuary Proposal. The Governor wrote a letter to our congressional delegation last December 2005, and also asked OPAC to advise him on what a national marine sanctuary could look like off the coast of Oregon. And OPAC is working on providing the Governor with a status report by the end of this year.

It's obviously a very complicated process, and OPAC is doing a good job of looking at all of the different angles. But what the Governor has done, within the last month I'd say, is asked OPAC to really focus on two particular areas — fisheries management in the sanctuary and also the state-federal role and how the state would work with the Federal Government in managing the area off of Oregon.

Okay. But the Governor, when he

NEAL R. GROSS

proposed this last year, he saw a sanctuary as potentially bringing a variety of benefits to the state. It would promote and extend Oregon's ocean policies beyond the Three Mile Zone, and, again, it would be focusing on ecosystem-based multiple use management of our resources, ideally increase research and monitoring -- we're constantly hearing from all sides that we need to have more research and monitoring of our coast -- boosting Oregon's coastal economy, and ending the threat of offshore oil and gas drilling, and then, of course, protecting important marine habitats.

So moving on, the big West Coast Governor's Agreement on Ocean Health, how many of you guys were in California when we rolled that out, or at least saw it on video? Okay. So, basically, it has been a great partnership between Governor Schwarzenegger's office, Brian Baird from the resources agency down in California, and Kathleen Drew up in Governor Gregoire office.

NEAL R. GROSS

We had been collaborating for some time on what it would look like to have a regional agreement or a regional entity to address our California current system off the coast. And the Governor had actually had this concept on his website for over a year that he was interested in this regional concept, and that, again, was inspired by the recommendations of the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy, that we look at the regional ocean.

And so we started working on putting something down on paper, and it was -- it was launched on September 18th of this year, where we had Governor Schwarzenegger come into the Convention Center down in California, and we beamed Governors Kulongoski and Gregoire together via satellite down to launch the agreement. And I think it was fairly well received, and I'm beginning to get feedback from our constituent groups more now than ever.

And we definitely are focusing on -- the idea is that this is just a great way

NEAL R. GROSS

to increase collaboration between the three states. Governance, management, and planning structures we hope will be enhanced by this. We definitely want to share lessons learned.

In some areas -- California has made some remarkable steps, and they have struggled along the way, and maybe we can learn from some of the -- not saying there are any major mistakes made, but any of the problems that they had down there we can hope to improve upon it here in Oregon.

We certainly want to expand our scientific and educational efforts up and down the coast and create a coordinated management strategy, so we're in regular communication, and, of course, engage the Federal Government.

So we have proposed four specific actions. We didn't want it just to be on paper. We wanted to propose four specific actions to be completed within the first six months of the agreement. Definitely we wanted to focus on the number one problem off the coast for the west

NEAL R. GROSS

coast, which is non-point source pollution.

And to the second point, we actually, within a week or two of the agreement, did a joint letter to President Bush and to our Oregon, Washington, and California congressional delegations asking them to keep the moratorium on oil and gas development off our coast in place.

As you guys know, there is a big debate going on back in Congress, and so we wanted to lend our voice to the action back there, recognizing that they may in fact take it back up again after the November election.

And to tie into the work that Sea Grant is going to be doing on a regional research effort, we definitely wanted to support that and enhance that in any way we can.

And then, again, kind of that link to the federal agencies, we're hoping to work more closely with DEQ and having them work with the federal agencies to see how we can obtain some of the information for our efforts out here.

NEAL R. GROSS

The CEQ has that role of implementing the U.S.

Ocean Action Plan.

So that's just a little bit about some of the work I get to focus on, and it's very exciting for me personally. And I've had a chance to meet with a lot of folks up and down the coast, and I look forward to talking further with your about our actions.

DR. HIXON: Great. Thanks, Jessica.

What I'd like to do is hold questions
and comments until all three speakers have had
a chance to talk to us. That way all these
complementary issues can be addressed before we
go into discussion.

Appreciate your nice, succinct talk.

A good model.

Okay. Jim Good is a colleague at Oregon State University with me. For many years he ran the Marine Resource Management Program, which is a master's degree program in marine issues, and now is the Vice Chair of the Oregon Policy Advisory Council.

Jim?

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. GOOD: Good. Okay. We're up here. This is the hazards of deciding what we're going to talk about the night before, and then independently putting slide programs together. So I think a few of my slides are almost exactly the same as Jessica's, but what I'd -- can everybody hear me? What I'd like to talk about is to go back in time a little bit as well.

Okay. I guess I'd characterize ocean management in Oregon as something that's not new. Really, we started managing the ocean back in the 1960s when the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, and even before that, regulated fisheries within our territorial sea.

But generally, our engagement with ocean management started with different issues. It was reactive and gradually moved to this more expansive approach that we're really just beginning to take a look at now, which is more of the ecosystem-based management idea. How do you implement that at a very large scale?

So, let's see. The setting -- you

NEAL R. GROSS

got quite familiar with this last night. But the Oregon -- Oregon has sort of a mid-level width shelf and slope. The continental margin is roughly 40 -- 60 miles offshore where the abyss starts, so it's a relatively narrow shelf compared to, say, the east coast.

It's a continental collision plate.

We have subduction zone -- a subduction zone offshore that actually runs from Canada down to Cape Mendicino in California. And that's the one that's going to go off sometime with a magnitude 9 earthquake in the future. We've had I think something like seven of them in the last 3,500 years, so -- and the last one was about 300 years ago, so we're due. We may see a reshaping of our coast in the future.

Anyway, we have -- in terms of the offshore oceanography, we have the very cold southward flowing California current. We have seasonal upwelling that happens and then relaxes and happens again during the spring, summer, and early fall. We have major fisheries. Salmon

NEAL R. GROSS

and tuna are one example, dungeonness crab, shrimp, groundfish, those are the major fisheries, and there's lots of smaller fisheries as well.

Shipping, mainly into the Columbia River, but we also have two coastal ports that are deep draft ports here in Newport, not a lot of traffic, and also Coos Bay, and a lot of recreational activities, which are actually increasing more things related to ecotourism and such.

What I'm going to do is just sort of take you through a very brief history here of ocean management, again, mostly small scale local fisheries in the '60s and '70 with state-level management. The sort of drive to Americanize the fisheries led to the Fishery Conservation Management Act of 1976, and that was certainly an issue here off of Oregon. You could get your binos out and see very large factory trollers out there in the -- particularly the early '70s.

Also, in the mid-'70s, there was more of a coastal zone management focus -- estuaries,

NEAL R. GROSS

people talked about a crisis in estuaries with dredging and filling, and so forth, and beaches, shore lands, coastal development.

And at that time, in 1976, we adopted Oregon's first ocean policy, which was actually Dick Hildreth, a colleague at the University of Oregon Law School, who some of you may know, would characterize that as one of the most advanced concepts in ocean policy that had been passed and is still, we think, a very good policy.

I'm not going to talk about that in detail, but we started pretty early with our coast management program with this ocean resources goal -- Goal 19.

In the late '70s, there was a proposal for an Oregon-Washington OCS lease sale, and that got attention of a lot of people -- all of the renewable resource users, fishers, recreationists, and such, and everybody -- nobody in Oregon I don't think actually wanted OCS oil and gas development, but that spurred additional interest in trying to do something for the oceans.

NEAL R. GROSS

We had marine oil spills. We had a spill right here, actually a shipwreck off the north jetty at Yaquina Bay. At really, really low tide you may be able to see the masts sticking up at the Blue Magpie. We had a pretty big spill off of the Columbia River in '87, and then in 1999 the New Carissa came ashore at -- just north of Coos Bay.

Some of the things that we've done in the '80s and particularly in the '80s was oil spill contingency planning along much of the coast to identify key resources.

In '83, President Reagan estimated the EECs through Executive Order. Very shortly thereafter, 1983, there was also a proposal by the Mineral Management Service to mine poly-metallic sulfides on the Gorda Ridge. These are the deep ocean spreading centers, and part of that deep ocean spreading center is within -- on the Gorda Ridge is within the exclusive economic zone. And that also got a lot of attention here in Oregon.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

There was another proposal to mine plasser minerals, particularly focusing on things like chromium and other strategic minerals off the southern Oregon coast. And, again, we had a lot of interest and effort there.

And then, we moved in the mid '80s, towards the end of the '80s, to what I'd characterize as more comprehensive area-based planning. We passed an Ocean Resources Management Act in 1987, a task force was formed to develop an ocean plan. There were meetings up and down the coast, and that resulted in a -- in the Oregon ocean plan, which was legislatively adopted in 1991.

OPAC was established as part of that adoption process, OPAC being the Ocean Policy Advisory Council, and one of the first tasks that they undertook was to develop a more detailed territorial sea management plan.

Sort of the next thing, continuing crises in fisheries and some responses at the national level, of course, the Sustainable

NEAL R. GROSS

Fisheries Act has led to major changes in how fisheries are managed here in the United States, and, incidentally, off of our coast.

At the state level, the OPAC response, based in part on a request by the Governor to OPAC, to come up with a proposal for establishing marine protected areas within the territorial sea. And, in 2002, there was a recommendation to establish this limited set of reserves that Jessica talked about, and I'll show you a few more things about that.

However, that actually led to significant controversy over that recommendation, and led to legislative restructuring of the Ocean Policy Advisory Council. The original Council had agencies and stakeholders all as voting members of the group. The new OPAC has basically stakeholders and public representatives as voting members, and agencies as ex officio members.

And this -- the first OPAC was chaired by the Governor's office, and we're now chaired

NEAL R. GROSS

by one of those voting members, your next speaker, Scott McMullen. So there's I think a different flavor of what we do in OPAC as to what we did before.

Governor Kulongoski has basically directed us in his first letter -- we first met in June of '05, the new OPAC, and he asked us to implement the controversial 2002 marine reserve recommendation. A couple months later he also asked us to advise him on a proposal he was making for a national marine sanctuary that would encompass a very large area off the Oregon coast, federal and state waters.

And just to cover a little bit more on those two recommendations, this reiterates some of the things that Jessica said, but basically it's worth I think saying again. The 2002 recommendation, and actually Scott McMullen was also the chair of the committee that put together this recommendation, but that group recommended, again, a limited system of marine research reserves.

NEAL R. GROSS

And I underscore "research," to test their effectiveness in meeting marine resource conservation objectives that have been laid out for a long time in that Goal 19 that we adopted in 1976, things like marine biodiversity protection, habitat protection, and such.

The process was to include these two phases, kind of an initial planning phase of two to three years with local involvement, identifying criteria for where they should go, working with a science team to identify the types of research questions we would want to ask in these -- with these reserves, and Phase 2 would be the actual designation process. And there really isn't a clear design for how we would do that.

There is no fishery-specific recommendation. We didn't recommend -- OPAC did not recommend to establish reserves to improve fisheries or to do those kinds of things, although those might be some of the research questions that we would ask. If you want to find a little

NEAL R. GROSS

bit more about this, you can go to that site shown there.

I've just basically talked about the marine reserve planning progress. Oregon, of jurisdiction only has the course, over territorial sea, but and we're just getting -- and that would be where we have the authority to establish marine reserves.

The question arises, though, is that going to be sufficient in terms of where we have reserves to answer the kinds of questions that are out there, and that's something that we're bouncing back and forth on right now.

Again, the process is just underway. We've formed a marine reserves working group. We have committed to form a science panel. We're use our existing sort of science brokers to identify those people we should be working with to develop, you know, that experimental design for what we would want to get out of our marine reserves.

We will be initiating a public

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

process to get input, particularly on constraints and what local interest might be. We hope to build on lessons learned elsewhere. We had a presentation at our meeting yesterday about the report, which many of you have probably seen, that talks about lessons learned from Triper Tugas, Northwest Straits, and a number of other efforts. Again, the focus will be on research reserves.

So we're not talking about building the ultimate conservation system right now. What we're talking about is identifying a few areas to basically do research in in west coast temperate waters to learn more about how these things work, do they achieve the benefits that have been shown in other areas.

And some people say, "Well, we don't need to do that. We can, you know, just build on what has been learned elsewhere." We're not Missouri, but I think we're a "Show Me State," and so we want to take a look at how things work here.

NEAL R. GROSS

This is a slide that's similar to the one that Jessica showed, but it's the second major MPA proposal that OPAC is looking at, and that is the proposed Oregon coast national marine sanctuary. We've got to come up with a different name for that, though, because there's the Olympic Coast national marine sanctuary, and if you're just into acronyms and speak in acronyms, you're not going to know which area you're talking about. So I'll just go backwards a little bit. This ocean stewardship area, what's Oregon, when it adopted its ocean plan in 1991, said, "Well, we only have jurisdiction over the territorial sea, but actually we had an interest in the activities that occur, really, all the way out to the edge of the continental margin."

And that we designated in our ocean plan -- and that was reinforced in the territorial sea plan -- that we have -- we claimed an active interest in that area and wanted to be involved in proposals and activities there. And, really,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

it's an attempt I think to sort of stretch our -- not our jurisdiction so much but to stretch our involvement in those activities.

of course, under coastal zone management the activities there need to be consistent with our state coastal management program and our ocean plan as part of our state coastal management program. So we have at least a little bit of hedge room to go out there and say, you know, "Feds, you need to coordinate with us when you're doing various things."

So the Governor said, basically, this sounds like -- if we're going to implement ecosystem-based management in Oregon, this sounds like a reasonable area to do it in. It's large, it's an area that we don't have much influence now on, but the -- a national marine sanctuary would extend that significantly.

So what we have done on the sanctuary proposal? These are some of the same things that Jessica laid out. But the Governor's goal was really to focus on long-term health of ecosystems,

NEAL R. GROSS

resources, ecosystem-based management was a major focus there. Some of the benefits -- Jessica outlined those. These benefits are one of the things that we're looking at at OPAC in our -- and we have a national marine sanctuary working group put together to evaluate this proposal.

But we're looking at: are these benefits real, or not? Or maybe there are some distant benefits associated with some of these things. So we're really taking -- trying to take a hard look at that. And our role overall in the sanctuary process right now is to do a kind of preliminary scoping.

If the Governor decides to go ahead, a formal scoping process would start under the National Marine Sanctuary Program, eventually potentially leading to a designation, development of the management plan, probably six-, seven-, eight-year process, given the history of other areas.

Another interesting sort of factoid

NEAL R. GROSS

about the proposal of having the ocean stewardship area as the national marine sanctuary is that's about 21,000 square miles, which is more than all of the other -- area than all of the other sanctuaries put together and about four times larger than the largest sanctuary, which is the Monterey Bay national marine sanctuary. I'm not counting the new national monument on Hawaii Islands.

So it's a huge -- it presents a huge challenge to think about a sanctuary of that scale. But anyway, our goal is really to -- to go out to the public and gather input to assess the best way to meet the Governor's goals. If it's -- that sanctuary is not the appropriate thing, what would be a good alternative?

We're trying to identify key issues to address in the designation process for future management planning, and we're to provide the recommendations, as Jessica said, by the end of -- the end of December.

The present status is that the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Governor has asked us for a status report. We've kind of had a start, stop, staggered approach to getting, for example, public involvement off the ground. We have very little money to do -- very little funding and staffing support to do this work, so it has kind of dragged on slowly this year.

But that status report request is really -- we've learned a lot. We've had a lot of public comment at our regular OPAC meetings. We've had -- we have done some research. We have contracted with Oregon State to develop a background report. So we have a lot of information and feel like we can really come up with some good findings and what the implications of those findings are.

And then, the Governor has said that he'll advise us as to what he wants our next steps to be. So that's sort of a history of moving from very issue-based marine resource management to more of an area-based approach, which we're heavily engaged in now.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	DR. HIXON: Thank you, Jim.
2	Okay. Our final speaker is Scott
3	McMullen. Scott is a long-time fisherman of the
4	Oregon coast, and is presently Chair of the Oregon
5	Fishermen's Cable Committee, which works out
6	arrangements between the trawl fleet and
7	telecommunications cables that are laid on the
8	sea floor. And he is presently Chair of the Oregon
9	Policy Advisory Council.
10	Scott?
11	MR. McMULLEN: Thank you. And I'd
12	just like to express my gratitude for getting
13	the opportunity to speak to this distinguished
14	body. I may be a little bit nervous this morning.
15	
16	
10	My background is quite a bit
17	My background is quite a bit different than Jessica and Jim's, and I didn't
17	different than Jessica and Jim's, and I didn't
17 18	different than Jessica and Jim's, and I didn't have Mark as a professor.
17 18 19	different than Jessica and Jim's, and I didn't have Mark as a professor. (Laughter.)

PARTICIPANT: You beat us to the punch.

(Laughter.)

MR. McMULLEN: But I'd like to give you not OPAC's views or me as Chair, but just me as an individual and maybe combined a little bit with what testimony -- some of the testimony that OPAC has heard from the fishing industry. And so I'll maybe give you a little different perspective.

Okay. Joe?

Okay. I wanted to tell you about a place that I'm -- that I know of. Okay? The surface sediment has been churned and churned repeatedly. The native -- large native species are all but gone, wiped out. The exploitation has gone on unchecked for decades.

Sometimes this disturbance goes on day and night, 24 hours a day. Diversity -- plant life diversity is virtually non-existent.

Non-native plant species now dominate this area.

The top surface is the sediment that has been

NEAL R. GROSS

churned repeatedly and repeatedly. Native species -- this was supposed to be a buffalo, by the way.

(Laughter.)

I didn't have a buffalo.

PARTICIPANT: Most of us wouldn't know the difference.

MR. McMULLEN: Non-native plant species dominates the area. Disturbance goes on day and night, and diversity is non-existent. We call these farms, and our -- the Willamette Valley, Kansas, Iowa, our country, the Great Plains are full of these areas.

We have -- when we discuss the ocean,

I want you to consider that from the fishing
industry perspective there may be some changes
that go on because of commercial fishing. I
don't -- I don't dispute that. I think over time
the fishing industry has learned, and we've made
tremendous changes, modified our gear,
reduced -- we used to use very large rollers.

Now some of that gear has been restricted, and

NEAL R. GROSS

we're using much smaller, much lighter tending gear.

To use the analogy of what we do terrestrially, we aren't churning up the top one foot of sediment. That is not happening. And with the exception of maybe scallop fishing on the east coast, it doesn't happen here anymore.

What I would like to have this group consider is that oftentimes we -- we seem to get this impression that any change is -- any human cause change is destructive. And if we look back to the analogy of farms, that's clearly not the case. We as a nation value our farm industry, our agriculture industry. We recognize that the farms of Iowa, Kansas, Willamnet Valley all produce a great deal of food for our country.

We had testimony at OPAC that presented information that if the United States were left in sort of the natural condition as indigenous people had it, we would probably only be able to support about one in ten of our population. So if you look around the room, how

NEAL R. GROSS

few people would be here if -- if the nine people alongside of you weren't in the room.

So I would like everyone to consider that, yes, there may be human cause change, but if, as in farms, the change produces a value and a benefit to the nation, then maybe that's something we shouldn't be quick to disallow.

I think it -- actually, exploitation of our natural resources makes a good case to set aside special areas and to set some areas aside, like we do with national parks, that are untouched and that are sort of somewhat pristine. The reality is we do have some of those. We have a lot of those areas off our coast.

Can I get the next slide, Joe?

We have an area off the west coast called the Rock Fish Conservation Area. Okay? This began in 2003. Okay? Extends from the Canadian border to Mexico. It varies. It changes. It changes widths from year to year and within the year, but it's at all times a minimum of 100 fathoms of depth.

NEAL R. GROSS

There is -- one part of that area has been completely closed since its inception, never -- never been open to trawl fishing again.

Here is one example of it. This is the area off Cape Flattery in 2003.

The fishing grounds in this area did start at the Three Mile Line, which you see the inside band of yellow. That's the Three Mile state waters in Washington. So the fishing grounds previously had began at the outside of that thin Three Mile ribbon and extended out to about 650 fathoms. This closure obviously closed the bulk of that grounds.

Okay. Here is another example. This is sort of an extreme example, when in November/December the area from 250 fathoms to the shore was all -- was completely closed. Okay? Most of the time it's much smaller; it looks like this.

This is 100 to 200 fathoms, varies depending on the depth from one mile to 15 miles wide. There's another example. This is off the

NEAL R. GROSS

Columbia River. This was a fairly recent one -- version of it.

The green sort of dotted line on the outside is sort of the end of the outside edge of the fishing activity. So you see we have a pretty significant amount of a marine protected area that's stopping one type of fishing, trawl fishing.

There is -- recently, the President sent a memo to the United Nations, and I think it had to do with destructive fishing. And while he didn't say trawling was destructive fishing in that memo, I understand that his press secretary gave trawling as one of the examples of this destructive fishing.

And in my work as Chairman of the Oregon Fishermen's Cable Committee, we review a lot of the video after we go to sea and observe live a lot of the video from the remote operated vehicles that are on the sea floor inspecting submarine cables.

Most of the time the -- we are able

NEAL R. GROSS

to encourage the routing of these cables into soft, muddy bottom, because it has the least impact to the fishing industry. We want to seek complete burial of the cables, so that there is no interference and the fishing industry can continue to operate.

Generally, it takes a -- sort of a magnetometer type device to determine where the cable is, because after the -- this plow -- and the plow is far more invasive than our bottom fish gear. But the plow digs a trench typically one meter deep and about six to eight inches wide.

Often you cannot tell where that cable track is without the use of a magnetometer, because it's so healed up. The current has moved sediment back and forth, and actually within days you can't even find any trench whatsoever. There are exceptions to this. There are trenches where it's in clay and that trench stays visible for a longer time.

But in the process of looking at these videotapes, we have very little evidence of trawl

NEAL R. GROSS

fishing activity. We go through areas that are soft, muddy bottom, which are the same bottom that we conduct our trawl fisheries on. And you try to find a trawl track, sometimes referred to as trawl scars, it is very, very difficult.

We do see with the use of sonar sometimes a change in the -- in the surface topography, but it is so minor that when you get -- you see it with the sonar, when you get there with the video cameras you can't even -- can't even see it.

So I guess I'd like to make the case that I think that there's very little destruction going on in the fisheries today, and the fishing industry is vastly reduced from what it once was.

And maybe when you get out of these meetings, if I could encourage you to take a drive down the coast, the seat ahead is about 35 miles south of here. Has a high viewpoint where you can see a long ways. My guess is probably from that viewpoint you probably can see 600 square miles

NEAL R. GROSS

of ocean if you have a good set of binoculars.

If you go there, go up to Otter Crest, take your binoculars and count how many fishing vessels you see. And I can just about guarantee you if you see more than two you're going to be -- you're going to be doing real well for seeing the fleet.

We really don't have much of a fleet anymore on this coast, and there isn't a lot of pressure on our ground. So that's sort of a fishing perspective. We aren't opposed -- I mean, I think personally I'm not opposed to having some reference areas, and I totally support the OPAC process to set up some -- some test areas to see the effectiveness.

But I guess in the fishing industry we're not entirely convinced of what the problems are that aren't already being addressed through the traditional management regimes that are in place.

DR. HIXON: Okay. Thank you, Scott.
Okay. We'd now like to open this up

NEAL R. GROSS

for actually about a half an hour of question and discussion.

Now, because this meeting is being recorded, we have to do this in a fairly organized way. So I ask people to raise their hand first, then when they're called on to state their name for the recorder, nice and clearly, and then speak loudly enough if you don't have a microphone so that people can hear.

So, Gil?

MR. RADONSKI: Gil Radonski. I had the opportunity to drive down Highway 101 prior to coming to this meeting, went and saw beautiful things that you talked about. And they -- they're more beautiful than you can imagine. I think Oregon has a real treasure in its coastal environment.

One of the things that struck me is as you were -- the two people, Jessica and -- I didn't get your name.

MR. GOOD: Jim.

MR. RADONSKI: Jim? Jessica and Jim?

NEAL R. GROSS

Talked about things that they want to do in the future. And one of the things that struck me was the idea of boosting the economies of coastal communities. This is sort of a catch 22 situation. I mean, if we boost these economies, attract more people, we're going to have -- there is more and more need for greater protection.

And you look at these fragile environments, and you really get caught. Do we want to -- do we want to have more businesses?

We know we're going to have more people, because I think you people have done an outstanding job of public awareness and explaining what you're looking at.

I drove into all the access sites that I could, everywhere there was the Oregon State Park designation. You do a great job of interpretive work and really impressive. But I am concerned with this idea of the more you build up, the more we have a greater need for protection.

And I have a comment on the commercial

NEAL R. GROSS

fishing side. I live in -- on the coast in North Carolina.

 $\label{eq:MS.HAMILTON: That's where I'm from,} % \begin{center} \begin{center} MS. HAMILTON: That's where I'm from, \\ \begin{center} \begin$

MR. RADONSKI: Oh, great.

(Laughter.)

So you'll perhaps know the names of some of these areas that I'm talking about. We have a big fishing community called Parker's Island, and it's -- it's the historic part of North Carolina. This is where the fleets -- fleets operate out of, and they are more threatened now, not by the lack of fishery resource, because many of the fisheries in North Carolina are overfished, their threat is from development.

They are sitting on very valuable land, and we see more and more these fishermen have literally hit the lottery. I mean, they can go to sea and work their tails off and eek out a living, or they can just sell their property to developers and walk away with a million dollars

NEAL R. GROSS

1 in their pocket. I mean, it's getting to that 2 Small pieces of land on the ocean sell point. for a million dollars commonly in North Carolina. 3 So we see a -- the coastal -- the 4 fishing communities on the coast disappearing 5 not so much from the fishery resource 6 exploitation but from the rising cost of land 7 values. And that's not a question; it's merely 8 an observation. 9 10 And thank you for your everybody's contribution. And I see that Mark 11 Hixon has his groupies here today. 12 13 (Laughter.) Now, we appreciate everybody coming 14 15 and seeing what goes on with the MPA Advisory 16 Committee. Thank you. 17 DR. HIXON: Thanks a lot, Gil. 18 19 (Laughter.) One point of clarification. 20 first going to take questions from the Federal 21 Advisory Committee. And then, if there's time, 22

we'll address questions from the audience at large.

So, Mike?

DR. CRUICKSHANK: I'm Mike

Cruickshank. I had a question. I was confused that -- last night we saw a wonderful movie showing I thought it was rockfish we were looking at. And then, this morning I hear that the rockfish fisheries are mainly on soft bottoms.

Can you -- will you tell me, please, what the actual environment of the rockfish is?

DR. HIXON: Go ahead, Scott.

MR. McMULLEN: Yes, the rockfish is primarily found on a rocky environment. And there is very little fishing on that. Now, there is a number of reasons. One, there was determination that some species were overfished, and the term "overfished" is sort of misleading, because you can actually have a species that's overfished without any fishing on it whatsoever.

"Overfished" definition has to do with the status of the stock. So even in cases

NEAL R. GROSS

where you have a natural low point in a stock cycle you can have a classification of overfished.

But certainly fishing pressure has impacted some of those.

We had, for example, as was mentioned the foreign fleets that were fishing off our coast hit the Pacific Ocean perch stocks very, very hard in the '60s. And those stocks are still in the rebuilding plan, and it's going to take a long time, according to our scientists.

So in order to protect some of those stocks, even though many were still considered healthy, the habitat in which the rockfish lived was closed. We did a number of things through our traditional management. One is we reduced the quantity of rockfish that could be landed. There's trip limits, and in most cases the rockfish are down to sort of incidental or zero take levels.

Secondly, we made this rockfish conservation zone, which is a band that rockfish typically live in, and it's closed to all trawling.

NEAL R. GROSS

So depending on the time of year and the species that are concerned -- that we have concerns about, we adjust those lines to allow prosecution of some stocks, if we believe that we can do that in a safe way without affecting stocks that are still in a rebuilding.

There's a third thing, and I'm trying to think what it is, but what we -- we have a very reduced limit on what we can bring in. We have closures to protect that, and simply we aren't fishing rockfish as a targeted fishery, except some stocks midwater fish, but primarily the bulk of the trawl activity is all on smooth, soft bottom.

DR. HIXON: Thank you. Also, if you have questions for particular panel members, make that -- make that clear.

Tony?

DR. CHATWIN: Thank you. Anthony Chatwin. Thanks for the three presentations. I found them really interesting, and I have just a couple of questions. One is in relation to

NEAL R. GROSS

the research reserves.

Well, I guess it -- wasn't it being designated, or they were in the process of being designated? The question is whether they have or not. And then, an associated issues, which is very important to us here is, if they have been designated, what is the duration that they are being designated for?

DR. HIXON: Jim?

MR. GOOD: They haven't been designated yet, and I -- I expect that it will be a several-year process to do so. And we are thinking of these as probably -- Scott, you may be able to answer this better, or Frank. The Chair of our Marine Reserves Working Group is here, too. I don't -- I don't see him right now, but --

PARTICIPANT: He's right here.

MR. GOOD: Oh, he's in the back. But we're -- I've heard figures like, you know, 20 years maybe, 25 years, to set these things aside to allow for long-term ecological research to

NEAL R. GROSS

see how they work. But, again, they're tests, and if they don't work maybe they'll go away. If they are everything that we would hope they would be, maybe we'll have more. I don't know. That's for another generation to consider I quess.

But that's where we stand. We're just beginning the implementation of the marine reserve process. We don't even have a detailed process together yet, or a budget. Budget is a big thing. We're not going to do this without any resources. We're certainly not going to do it well without any resources, and we don't have any resources presently.

No state agency has marine reserve planning in their budget, for example, and we'd like to see that change, but that's sort of where we are. So we're in the very beginning stages.

DR. CHATWIN: Can I just follow up on that? And the reason I ask this is because in the development of this national system of marine protected areas we're looking at criteria

NEAL R. GROSS

and definitions that would determine whether or not a site would be eligible to be included in the national system of marine protected areas, of course depending on the will of the agency or the authority that's -- whether they're interested or not in becoming part of the system.

But in it -- in the framework which is now out for public comment, there is a definition of -- that sites have to -- in their implementation they have to have -- to be creative, with the intent of being permanent. And so in that case, if there is -- in my interpretation, if there's a limited term to these research reserves, they may not be eligible for inclusion, which means that any benefits that the national system may bring wouldn't be eligible for research.

And some of the benefits -- these all -- we all brainstormed about this, that some of the benefits could be more capacity for research and monitoring, which is the objective.

NEAL R. GROSS

So I would just encourage you and this Commission to, during the public comment period, look at that, look at the interests of research reserves, because I think they're very important tools for all of the interested groups to increase their understanding and acceptance or not of these -- of protected areas as a tool for ocean management.

But I'm just concerned that, from what I have heard here, one of the steps that you are contemplating might not be eligible for this national system, and that's a concern to me. So I would encourage you to look at this and use the public comment process to make your use of it.

MR. GOOD: Yes. The principal benefit we would see of being in the national system presumably is if there were money available in the national system to do the research. There are other pots of money as well, and -- or other non-pots of money, too. We don't find a lot of money floating around for planning or

NEAL R. GROSS

implementation of these things.

We will likely not implement the research reserves until a research plan is in place and funding for long-term monitoring established. And so we're -- we're concerned about putting something in place and then having no work be done there. And we don't want to -- we don't want to do that.

So we also plan I think -- Scott and I and others have talked about taking on a review of the framework plan, and we'll learn a lot in doing that, taking a -- looking at that as an Ocean Policy Council and providing some comments to you all. So maybe we'll comment that there needs to be a little more flexibility.

MS. HAMILTON: Yes. Actually, we -- Jessica from the Governor's office. We had had a conference call with Jim and Scott and Mike Carrier, my boss, a couple of weeks ago, and that was one of the requests that we were going to bring to OPAC is asking for their assistance with the Governor's comments on your

NEAL R. GROSS

1 framework. So just to let you know that we 2 are -- we all have our eyes on it, but we did not talk about it during yesterday's OPAC 3 4 meeting. So any feedback from you guys on what 5 you'd like to have the Governor focus on, I think 6 7 it could certainly be a two-way street before we just send you our comments. 8 DR. HIXON: Okay. I've got a list. 9 10 I've got George, Jim, John, Bob, Max, Steve, and Brian. 11 (Laughter.) 12 13 George? MR. LAPOINTE: First, I want to thank 14 15 the speakers as well. My name is George Lapointe. 16 The first is a comment on budget. I work in the State of Maine, and our New England Governors 17 are trying to do similar things. 18 19 And it strikes me that if we got all 38 coastal governors together we could -- one 20 of the Ocean Commission recommendations was that 21

I think we double funding for ocean stuff.

we're all desperately competitive for the current pot of funding, which makes it hard to work together.

So I want to talk to Jessica about trying to become -- get more coordinated in terms of getting the funding we all know we need for all kinds of ocean management, including ocean reserves.

I want to follow up with Tony's comment on the length of the reserves. I think we need to be honest that these need to be closed for along time. You know, just if -- this is Mark's purview more than mine, but if we've had areas that have been impacted -- and this -- again, this is an east coast example. For hundreds of years we made -- you know, I mean, we're going to talk about closing in terms of permanence, and we need to be honest with the public about that.

And then, the last is a question for Scott. You've got this -- this rockfish closed area, which is long and narrow. And, again, in

NEAL R. GROSS

our east coast experience the issue of enforcement and effectiveness is a question. How is that enforced so that you know that this tiny little ribbon -- and it looks tiny on the map, and I suspect it looks huge when it's on your platter on the water, but how is that enforced so that, in fact, you get effectiveness of the management objectives?

MR. McMULLEN: Yes. It was first -- it was first enforced by simply giving fishermen the coordinates and telling them that if you're caught you're going to be cited.

And the Coast Guard flew helicopters and planes over, and they made a couple -- they found a couple cases where a fisherman -- for example, the line might be 250 fathoms, and we had a fisherman who was caught because he was towing in what he thought was outside of 250 fathoms, but it was actually a line that approximates the 250 fathom line, and the line was the boundary, not the depth.

But now -- so anyway, in my mind it

NEAL R. GROSS

was quite effective enforcement. Now we have a vessel monitoring system, a VMS box on the vessel, that sends a GPS position to a satellite which is sent on to National Marine Fisheries Service. So there is I think virtually 100 percent compliance.

Occasionally, a fisherman will drift into the area while he's picking up, something like that, but very -- very little impact into the zone.

MR. LAPOINTE: Thank you.

DR. HIXON: Okay. Jim?

DR. RAY: Yes, Jim Ray. I was glad to hear your comments about the need for adequate funding. I was looking at your proposal, you know, potentially trying to set up a national marine sanctuary encompassing the entire coast.

This committee for the last couple of years, as we've talked about marine protected areas, one of the common themes that has come up time and time again is that if you don't have adequate funding, you can't carry out the mandate

NEAL R. GROSS

of a protected area or a sanctuary.

The National Marine Sanctuaries
Program is a classic example of that. If you
take a look at the mandates of research protection
or enforcement education, if you have an area
of 21,000 square miles, my first question is:
have you calculated what it would cost to actually
have an area there and carry out its mandate?

And the other thing is, is that with a National Marine Sanctuaries Program that is already extremely tight and strapped with what they have got, would you make an area of 21,000 square miles when you may be able to make half a dozen or more areas of smaller sizes, and maybe protect more sensitive areas throughout the country?

So I think you have a very hard time competing for money with a proposal of that size. I would hope as you go forward with your plans that the cost estimates of what that might really cost are on the table, because I think that's a very important part. If you don't have adequate

NEAL R. GROSS

funding, it really never will achieve what you 1 2 would hope it would achieve. MS. HAMILTON: Thank you. We are 3 constantly reminded of that by our OPAC members. 4 And I do think that the Governor selected the 5 Oregon stewardship area as -- you know, the whole 6 7 area largely because he didn't want any section to be left out. So that was part of the reason, 8 too, is there are so many special and remarkable 9 10 places along the coast to allow OPAC to evaluate that entire area, so that they wouldn't leave 11 any sections out. 12 But you're right, that's one of the 13 factors that we'll take into consideration. 14 DR. HIXON: Okay. John? 15 DR. OGDEN: Thanks. Thanks very much 16 for your talks and for coming out. John Ogden. 17 I'm from Florida. And not surprising, I'm sure, 18 19 to you I'm struck by the -- by the similarities of the issues that the governments of these 20 coastal states are grappling with. 21

And we have a Florida Oceans and

Coastal Council very similar to -- in concept 1 2 to your OPAC, bucking the political winds, in some ways intended by the legislature and the 3 Governor to be a "go slow" committee as opposed 4 "get the job done" committee. 5 But nonetheless, we are working on the same issues. 6 We have a Gulf of Mexico alliance 7 similar to the recent signed tripartheid 8 9 agreement. 10 MS. HAMILTON: You were first. (Laughter.) 11 DR. OGDEN: That's right. I think, 12 13 basically, that's all we were, because there's no substance behind it. 14 (Laughter.) 15 So the -- I guess my question is: 16 to what degree -- and it really falls on what 17 George just said. He stole my thunder, but he 18 19 was talking about funding. But I'm really talking about political will and leverage. To what degree 20 can we get coastal states together? 21

To what degree can we communicate

with the very earnest and well meaning and right-thinking people who are in the Florida government, like yourselves, who are grappling with these issues? Can you get together and essentially use that combined leverage to get what you need to get these jobs done?

I was impressed by talking to Brian Baird at the CWO conference, who is coming in Director, Coastal as the CSA States Association have Ι got that Organization Director, and he is -- seems to me to be the kind of guy who would take this on board naturally.

So I guess my question is, if there is a question in all of this, is to what degree do you associate with other states and gain from their experience? And do you think that we could do something like George has suggested? But not only the funding -- well, it is funding, but it's also political will.

MS. HAMILTON: That's great. And we all invite you back out here to Oregon in July

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

'07 for the coastal zone meeting. And I do know we're discussing having a panel where we have representatives of all the different regional groups discuss their plans. So that might be one of the first steps, but maybe we could do things before that.

And Brian Baird is definitely a key actor in the West Coast Governor's Agreement on Ocean Health. So to the extent we could have something like the -- I know the Western Governor's Association where the Governors get together out here, I know there's a coastal caucus for the Washington, D.C. members of Congress, right? But so nothing exists in terms of coastal governors as far as you know.

DR. OGDEN: Not as far as I know, and I think it's a wide open field.

MS. HAMILTON: Right.

DR. OGDEN: It would be wonderful if something like that could happen around Brian Baird's chairmanship of the CW -- coast states organization.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	MS. HAMILTON: That would be great.
2	And I'll be visiting my parents in Florida in
3	December, so maybe we can
4	DR. OGDEN: Oh. Well, just give me
5	a call, and we'll show you around.
6	MS. HAMILTON: That's great.
7	DR. HIXON: Okay. Thank you. Okay.
8	Max, then Steve, then Brian. Max?
9	MR. PETERSON: First, thank you for
10	your
11	DR. HIXON: I'm sorry. I left someone
12	out. Bob, you're in front of everybody else.
13	MR. ZALES: I'm Bob Zales. I've got
14	a question for all three of you. I'm from Florida,
15	too, in the panhandle, and I represent charter
16	fishermen across the country. I'm President of
17	a national association.
18	In this framework that we've done and
19	what's out well, the comment now, we've
20	suggested ways to become part of the national
21	MPA system. And one of the things that I've
22	struggled with from the day that I was appointed

to this panel is, what is the benefit to get in that system?

So from all three of you, I mean, I heard in -- and the reason I ask this is because I heard the thing about money, which is money is always a big prize, that's not going to happen.

What is the incentive for you that you see, that you would like to see, by being recognized as being part of the national system?

MR. GOOD: Boy, I don't know. (Laughter.)

I guess you tell me, because, you know, at one level we get somewhat parochial about our issues and problems and how we solve them, and, you know, I'm not sure what the value would be, other than maybe get -- getting together periodically to share lessons learned and experiences. There are already national meetings that people go to to do that or groups like this.

I think funding is for research, setting up regional monitoring programs much like the national estuarian research reserve program

NEAL R. GROSS

has a national focused monitoring program, and there are some monies, albeit not much, but there are some monies provided for that.

So I think that's -- you know, that's what we would be most interested in I think is learning from others' experience and having funding for monitoring, for research, etcetera.

MR. McMULLEN: Well, Bob, I don't -- I have to admit I just don't know enough about it to give a good answer. I don't know. I have to -- I haven't read the draft framework yet, and I'm not familiar enough with the national program to be able to give a good answer. So, sorry.

MS. HAMILTON: I think when you look at the map of the west coast you see California has many protections, you know, reserves, planned reserves and sanctuaries. You look at Washington and they have the national marine sanctuary.

Oregon is a little bit empty in the sense of areas and state waters that have been designated. So I think in a way being a part

NEAL R. GROSS

of the national network helps bring Oregon into the national scene and gets us connected to what all of the other states are doing.

DR. HIXON: Thank you. Now, Max

versus Steve, then Brian.

MR. PETERSON: First, I want to thank you for an interesting presentation. I would say the Oregon process is certainly deliberate. There's nothing very hurried about this. It's a real long process with a long set of research ahead of time. I wonder if you can't learn something from other areas, at least give you some idea to at least establish a management regime in some places and not just another 25 years of research. That would be one comment.

The second thing I would suggest is that I noticed that one of the things you want to do is to close up offshore oil and gas drilling.

There's only two places we don't want to drill for oil nowadays, and one's onshore and the other is offshore.

(Laughter.)

NEAL R. GROSS

1 But want to become 2 independent. The Gulf States' offshore are saying, "We're kind of tired of producing all 3 this oil to send to California and other high 4 energy-using states." 5 MS. HAMILTON: They really say that? 6 7 MR. PETERSON: They really say that. So the question is: if you're going to go to 8 the national level and ask them for money, is 9 10 there any federal regimen going to come in from what you're going to do out here? Because OMB 11 is asking, what are the costs, what are the 12 13 benefits to the national treasury to do this? Unless you can show a positive cashflow, you're 14 unlikely to get money for a new program. 15 MS. HAMILTON: Right. 16 It's just that's the 17 MR. PETERSON: world today, because they're looking for programs 18 19 to -- to zero out, not programs to add. That's the reality, of course. But anyway, I applaud 20

NEAL R. GROSS

you for the work you're doing. Thank you.

MR. GOOD: Can I make a comment?

21

1 MS. HAMILTON: Yes. MR. Well, 2 GOOD: we're actually -- another working group that OPAC has 3 is the Wave Energy Working Group. So we're going 4 to use our renewable wave resource, which 5 averages about -- you know, I think 6 7 significant wave height over the whole year is about three meters. You wouldn't believe it, 8 looking today, but, you know, we sometimes have, 9 10 you know, I recollect one storm -- when the New Carissa hit us, 45-foot waves just offshore. 11 So we have a lot of wave energy, and 12 13 so that's how we're going to send energy back to Louisiana and --14 (Laughter.) 15 But --16 We looked at the 17 MR. PETERSON: adverse consequences of capturing that. 18 19 have been some major studies done capturing wave energy, and one of the big questions is you have 20

NEAL R. GROSS

to develop substantial offshore infrastructure.

MR. GOOD: Yes, and we're working on

21

that. In fact, that's moving ahead post haste with several proposals and -- yes.

DR. HIXON: Okay. We're almost out of time, so I've got three people right now -- Steve, Brian, and Dennis -- if you could please be quick.

DR. MURRAY: This is Steve Murray from California. One thing that -- and thanks for coming here today and sharing the information with us.

One thing that strikes me is the difference that you have in terms of the goals that are driving your siting or implementation of marine reserve process compared to virtually every other process that I'm aware of. I'm a veteran of three years as a science panel member under the Channel Islands national marine sanctuary process, and I think I have -- I'm in my seventh year as a member of the science panel that worked on the California Marine Life Protection Act with a one-year sabbatical.

And all of those processes had goals

NEAL R. GROSS

that were directed at protecting and conserving ecosystems or communities or, alternatively, protecting sustainable resources. Yours -- your goals seem to be a research-driven sort of goal set for your process, which means that inside that research-driven goal set you're going to need to come up with specific kinds of biological or natural resource or other features that you're going to need to identify.

This will make this a very strongly science-driven process, much more so than the processes that I've been familiar with where science was a guiding and advisory influence. But if you're now talking about designing a test set of reserves, you're going to have some very strong constraints and limitations based upon size/spacing that will necessarily be science-driven.

So this will require a very strong commitment to the science team, a very strong science team, and, of course, you're well endowed with some very respected scientists in Oregon

NEAL R. GROSS

who can play those roles.

I think that the other issue would be the length of time that you're looking to give your science-based results, because as Max pointed out -- and you've already indicated -- you're thinking in a 20-year timeframe.

So if you look at the implementation of this effort with a strong set of science-based design placements, and you look at the outcome when you eventually are able to assess whatever goals -- resource goals you set forward, you're probably 20 years downstream before you're ready to prepare what we would call, then, would be an effective implementation. And this really is, because that's satisfactory.

And one more piece of this would be whether or not you're planning for your reserve system to be established as a network, which is one of the things we talked about here in the national system, because networking will mean that -- a very strong science component to

NEAL R. GROSS

deciding how the -- between sites and sizes of sites will need to play out.

And if you look at the models that exist -- and probably the best one -- best two I think are the Channel Islands and the Marine Life Protection Act plans that have been forwarded. Both of those efforts resulted in attempts to network marine protected areas to protect diversity of habitat types.

And if you look at those models you'll see that -- you'll get some idea of the magnitude of the placements that would need to go in along the Oregon coast to achieve those kinds of objectives. So I think these are things to consider and consider very strongly as you move forward. But thanks for sharing with us what you have.

DR. HIXON: Okay. Very quickly, Brian and Dennis.

DR. MELZIAN: Good morning. I'm Brian Melzian, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

I have three very scientifically focused

NEAL R. GROSS

1 questions, which probably only need short answers, 2 at least for now. Regarding the quest for non-point 3 source funding in the future, is that related 4 to the recent episodes of hypoxia off the Oregon 5 coast? 6 7 MS. HAMILTON: No, sir. It's Yes, and actually a lot of the 8 unrelated. discussion about the dead zones off the coast 9 10 of Oregon, pollution was not necessarily a factor. 11 DR. MELZIAN: Okay. That's the first 12 13 Second, EPA and NOAA have conducted some deepwater surveys off the entire west coast 14 recently, including finding solitary shoals off 15 16 of the Oregon coast. Have any of those areas been closed to trawling because of the potential 17 impacts? Do you think there are real impacts 18 19 to those shoals? MR. McMULLEN: We have a large area 20 of -- Scott McMullen. We have an area from 700 21 fathoms out that has been closed to trawling 22

1	permanently. So all deepwater areas from this
2	line that approximates the 700 fathom curve has
3	been closed permanently to all trawling activity
4	in perpetuity.
5	DR. MELZIAN: Thank you. And my third
6	question is regarding trawling on soft bottom
7	communities where we have epifauna critters that
8	live above. Have there been before and after
9	control studies looking at reference sites where
10	no trawling occurs versus sites where trawling
11	has occurred on those soft bottom communities?
12	MR. McMULLEN: Brian, I could
13	probably say the answer is no. I believe that
14	when trawling first began on the Oregon coast
15	decades ago that there was no baseline studies
16	done. So pretty much I think it's safe to say
17	all of the area that can be trawled has been
18	trawled. So
19	DR. MELZIAN: Thank you.
20	DR. HIXON: Okay. And to finish up
21	very briefly, Dennis.

DR. HEINEMANN: Dennis Heinemann.

I work in D.C. where you'd be surprised there's a lot of trawling that goes on, and it's all for one species of --

(Laughter.)

It's something we call the scandalfish.

(Laughter.)

I noticed on one of the slides you described the research reserves as supporting research conservation objectives. And I'm wondering how broadly you apply the resource. Are you thinking primarily of exploited resources, the fisheries resources? Or are you thinking much broader than that, thinking about habitats and ecosystems?

And the reason I ask this question is that for research reserves, areas that are closed to all extractive activity, are perhaps one of the best tools you can use in some situations if you simultaneously want to protect habitats and ecosystems and possibly provide fisheries benefits. But if you're solely focused

NEAL R. GROSS

on fisheries benefits, they are probably not the best tool to use.

MR. GOOD: Actually, Goal 19, Oregon's ocean resources goal, which is part of its comprehensive land and water use planning program and part of its coastal management program, has specific language in there -- and I can't recall all of it, but it -- it's really much broader. I mean, it doesn't really single out fisheries at all.

It talks about biodiversity conservation. It talks about protecting critical or marine habitat that's critical to the various life stages of organisms and such. So it's really -- it's as broad as probably anything that you can come up with, and it's definitely not fisheries centric.

So, and I would say that those goals are the goals that a research program would be designed around, because what the recommendation was is to test how reserves are effective at meeting those broad conservation goals. So that

NEAL R. GROSS

will be one of the drivers of the -- of a research 1 2 design to implement reserves. DR. HIXON: Okay. Let's just thank 3 our panel. 4 (Applause.) 5 CHAIR BROMLEY: Thank you very much. 6 7 We'll take a short break, so that the next panel can set up. Please try to be back in five or 8 six minutes. 9 10 (Whereupon, the proceedings in the foregoing matter went off the record for a brief 11 recess.) 12 13 CHAIR BROMLEY: We do need to get going. I'm going to ask Lauren to introduce the 14 15 panel, and then we'll get going. MS. WENZEL: Thanks. At one of our 16 earlier meetings we had a presentation from the 17 Coastal States Organization about some of their 18 19 work on MPAs and MPA policies, and at that time we had some feedback from some -- our tribal 20 member and a couple of others saying they would 21

be very interested in hearing more about what

the tribes had to say about their own MPA policies and conservation work that they've done.

And out here in the northwest the tribes are very active partners in marine management and have a lot of programs and responsibilities in that area, and so we wanted to make sure we had an opportunity to hear from a couple of tribes about their perspectives and work on marine management.

So we're very happy to have our own Jim Woods, who is going to be talking to us about the McKaw tribe, and also Dave Hatch from the Confederate Tribes of Siletz with us. So we're going to hear from both of them, and then after they've both spoken we'll take questions.

Thanks.

MR. WOODS: Good. Thank you, Lauren.
Can everybody hear me?

My name is Jim Woods. I'm a member of the Federal Advisory Committee here. I'm also a McKaw tribal member and the policy advisor to the McKaw Tribal Council, overseeing

NEAL R. GROSS

environmental and marine policy for the tribe.

First off, I'd like to recognize -- and it's only appropriate for me to recognize that we're on Siletz land here, traditional land of the Siletz people, my relatives. And so I'd like to just recognize that first off.

I guess what I want to do is -- and bear with me. I've been waiting for Toastmasters to make it to the McKaw Reservation.

(Laughter.)

So I'm not much of a speaker, but I want to start off by talking a little bit about where I come from and my homeland in Washington State. I live near Neha Bay on a very olympic peninsula in the very northwest tip of Washington State.

I live actually on McKaw Bay on the Pacific side. This is my beach. This is like my front yard. I live right along the beach in a traditional McKaw village of Suez. And I have all five of our villages. That's the village

NEAL R. GROSS

where my family has been for thousands of years.

Just right down the beach there is areas like this with the petroglyphs over 2,000 years old. There's a lot of culture, a lot of history where I come from, and this is what it's all about. The little girl in the middle, that's Angelina, that's my daughter. I'm very fortunate to have the position I have representing my tribe and the native tribes of western Washington.

And this is what it's all about. It's about -- it's about the kids, the children. It's about paving the way and reassuring and guaranteeing that our children can carry on what our ancestors have given us.

The coast -- this is a shot I took just shooting down the coast from where I live.

There's a lot of -- again, I can't stress enough on the culture and the richness of the Olympic Coast.

This is Tattoo Island, the lighthouse.

On the McKaw Reservation we have two islands,
and that's a shot I took a couple of years ago.

NEAL R. GROSS

There I am at the McKaw Museum. It took 18 hours total to put that -- that skeleton of the great whale up. Many of you know about or heard of the McKaw Tribe as whalers. And that's the actual whale from 1990, the whale hunt that the McKaw did after 78 years I believe when we resumed whaling.

It's part of our culture. It's part of our treaty right. Back in 1913, or around in that time period, the McKaw voluntarily ceased whaling on our own to protect the species as they were depleting by the Russian and Asian commercial whaling depletion.

We have -- this is Ben Johnson, our Chairman.

We have a council of five councilmen. They are elected officials. We have our own judicial system. We have -- you know, just like any other small government.

In Washington State, in general, for the -- we have 28 federally recognized tribes.

NEAL R. GROSS

Usually in the custom areas -- in those areas that are guaranteed in our treaties, those are -- those are areas that historically we've hunted and fished. Seventeen tribes in western Washington have U&A that extends out into the marine waters. It's guaranteed in our treaty rights. There's four coastal tribes, along with the McKaw -- or three others I should say -- that have the Pacific Ocean marine waters in our treaty.

The Stevens Treaties were -- back in the mid-1850s. The McKaw Treaty, for example, was in 1855. We had a stand-alone treaty. Many of the northwest tribes where the government bulked tribes together and had -- had a treaty that would cover multi-tribes, well, the McKaw, we had a stand-alone treaty.

And we're going to talk also about the bold decision that reaffirmed our treaty right to fish -- the tribe's co-management authority, with the State of Washington, on fish resources and habitat requirements. And here's

NEAL R. GROSS

a little idea of -- you can see -- of the various tribes in Washington State.

Oh, yes, McKaw -- I'm all the way up here, the very northwest tip.

With the tribes, our -- when we talk about our concerns, when we talk about our interests, when we talk about our U&A, we're talking about not only the water and the fish, our -- our concerns and our efforts in protecting the environment reach far inland. There's the Puget Sound area and the Pacific Ocean.

We believe that, you know, talking with our elders they say that we've been here since the first dawn, which has been a long, long time. Some photos of -- some old McKaw photos.

As you can see, it's a real rich history of fisheries.

In the mid-1800s, 1850s, the series of the treaties were negotiated with the tribes in the region in exchange for giving up most of our land. Tribes reserved certain rights and protected their way of life, and here's a quote.

NEAL R. GROSS

This is actual language in one of the treaties about "Taking fish at usual and custom grounds and stations is further secured to said Indians, together with the privilege of hunting and gathering roots and berries on open and unclaimed lands." So that's the -- that's one treaty, which is a good example.

In the decades that follow, the promises of treaties were quickly broken, and tribes were denied their treaty-reserved rights by the State of Washington. It has been an ongoing battle of maintaining these treaties.

I believe every treaty that we've dealt with in the northwest has been broken at one point or another, or infringed on.

The struggle for recognition of these treaties climaxes in the fish wars. Back in the '60s when I was growing up, I remember a number of issues where, you know, grandpa would, you know, wake up in the morning and say, "I'm going to go out and get an elk," and the folks would say, "No, grandpa, you can't go out and get an

NEAL R. GROSS

elk. We're not allowed." And he said, "Oh, no, we have an agreement."

And they said, "No, we don't have an agreement." "Yes, we have an agreement with the white man." And he'd go out, and the next thing we knew the local county sheriff was knocking at the door and saying, "You've got to go get grandpa. We have him in jail."

And he'd get out and the following week he'd -- grandpa would go out again, go hunting, and they'd get him again. And that went on and on.

You know, as I started growing up in the '60s, we realized that there was something -- there was a document with the U.S. Government called a treaty, and we came to realize that, you know, grandpa was right.

In 1974, the federal court reaffirmed the treaty-protected fishing rights. That was the U.S. v. Washington. The Bolt decision, famously known as, has been upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court, establishing the tribes in western

NEAL R. GROSS

Washington as co-managers.

This ruling entitles the tribes to 50 percent of the harvestable salmon returning to Washington waters, created the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, which we have Fran Wilshusen here to assist me. In conducting orderly and biologically sound fisheries, the Fisheries Commission really plays a beneficial role with the western Washington tribes.

Okay. Well, in '74, the era of conflict ends and a new era begins. The tribe's crab and shellfish became increasingly important to the tribal economies. Fish are important to tribes, both culturally and economically.

We're recognized as salmon people in many regards of the coastal tribes all along the Washington and Oregon coast here. You can see she is preparing some salmon to bake. That's baked on the grill.

This is the traditional McKaw way that we cook. We actually take the salmon and clean it, and cut the backbone up and pull it

NEAL R. GROSS

out like a zipper and the meat just opens right up. And we put it on sticks around the fire. That's how we bake our salmon.

Like many of the tribes of the northwest, we have customs with like the first salmon of the year, in this case with the Kweli Tribe, performing a traditional custom.

This is Ho River. This is a fisherman fishing in the river. An old tribal member harvesting razor clams. Unloading halibut. The halibut is -- and I've got a little story to go with this slide, but the halibut is a real integral part of our fisheries, historically, economically.

When we were negotiating with our treaty back in 1855 with Governor Stevens, we were -- our elders were, you know, at the table knowing and understanding and realizing that they were losing all this land, and they were being consolidated onto a tribal reservation, a reserve.

And it was said that one of the chiefs

NEAL R. GROSS

stated that, "You know, you take my land, but don't take the ocean. Without halibut I'm a poor man, spiritually and socially and economically."

Here's more recent court -- federal court rulings upheld the treaty-reserved shellfish harvest rights, further expanded the role and responsibilities of the tribes as natural resource managers. It's a big responsibility when we're considered a resource manager or a fishery manager of the resources. There's quite a bit to it.

The habitat programs -- tribes maintain comprehensive environmental protection protections and watersheds throughout the state, you know, to support the management of the treaties -- treaty-reserved rights for these resources.

You know, everything from water quality programs to I'm even monitoring with -- we have a monitoring program for air quality monitoring the shipping traffic and the emissions that come off the shipping traffic that enter

NEAL R. GROSS

the straight -- all the shipping traffic to Seattle and Vancouver and Victoria and Port Angeles that pass our villages annually.

We've documented emission sources that come across the Pacific, heavy metals, mercury, that may contaminate our soil and our waters, and thus contaminate our fish. We look at a lot of science.

We're actually getting readings of pesticides in the air that are coming across the Pacific, pesticides that have been banned in this country since 1978 and it's 2006 and we're still picking up readings from other countries that are -- that are impacting us.

Data collected by tribes shows how many young salmon leave the streams, and used by Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission to create models projecting salmon returns. We look at a number of different types of data collection when we talk about salmon or halibut or black cod.

We're doing -- we have a scientist

NEAL R. GROSS

in my department, Yung Ling Gao, that they're doing actual odela sampling. That's a small earbone where they can actually cut these -- you know, in a lab they could actually cut this small earbone and read the rings and, you know, determine habitat conditions, migratory patterns.

They're looking at -- you know, we're doing genetic sampling -- or genetic testing and sampling where we could determine -- we take one fish and we determine where we're impacting, whether that's a Columbia River salmon or, you know, from Puget Sound, or what have you. So we do quite a bit of science.

Here's a photo of the training, doing habitat assessment and stream surveys. You know, we do flow modeling, and, you know, we look at a number of different things to determine in some of these rivers what is -- you know, the quality of the water, what the abundance of the water is to sustain the habitat, you know, if there is any potential surplus of water that could be

NEAL R. GROSS

utilized for freshwater and drinking, proposed framework for the MPAs.

Uncertainty of commitment or process for accommodating appropriate roles, authorities of tribal co-managers. We really need to look at how the whole process is with western Washington, for example, and our co-management authorities. You know, we're always -- the tribes are limited with staff and time.

Me, for example, I wear nine hats most of the time. The complexity of individual tribal governments from one government to the next is another -- another issue. Not all tribes have treaty rights. You know, there is -- different tribes have different priorities.

The western Washington tribes, the four coastal tribes, for example, really share the same -- we see utilization of marine protected areas as marine conservation management strategies, the function and integration of existing processes.

Through the Northwest Indian

NEAL R. GROSS

Fisheries Commission we have -- we have -- at one point we have developed marine protected areas policy, which Fran has copies of. We can pass it around.

Okay. Here are some suggestions -- incorporation of a tribal marine protected area statement, guiding principles within framework and detailing appropriate interaction with tribal governments. I think that's something that we really need to think about and incorporate.

Identify all tribes affected by the proposed framework, learn and incorporate tribal treaty and co-management requirements into protocols, activities, and products. Invoke acknowledgement of federal trust responsibility -- that's something that's very key, and I think it's really important for this -- for this group.

We're -- you know, we're a federal entity, we're a federal advisory committee, and I think every one of us around this table needs

NEAL R. GROSS

1 to clearly understand what trust responsibility is, what the responsibilities of the United 2 States are to the sovereign tribal government. 3 And, further, maintain communication pathways. 4 You know, is this what we're passing 5 around? This is a marine protected areas policy 6 7 statement. conclusion. Pacific in the 8 Northwest, the Bolt case 9 area tribes 10 expansive usual and custom areas, and corresponding management authorities. 11 functionally incorporate to 12 13 tribal treaty interests in any and all actions. Here's another key point that I'd 14 like make develop 15 government-to-government protocol with the tribe, 16 including issues of historical and cultural 17 relevance. These resources -- you know, the 18 19 cultural resources as well as governance. I think that's something that we need 20 to keep in mind working with the tribes, continue 21

NEAL R. GROSS

to improve communication with all affected tribes,

and not only am I talking about the coast of 1 2 Washington, I'm talking about, you know, the entire west coast, the Great Lakes, the Florida 3 area, and the eastern tribes. 4 Recognizing 5 engaged tribes as committed stewards of the marine 6 environment -- remember, tribes have 7 struggled with impact and compromise of their 8 treaty harvest opportunities. Some initiatives 9 10 aimed at marine protection also further erode tribal treaty harvest opportunities. 11 succeed, marine conservation 12 To efforts must include tribes and work within the 13 context of their status as co-managers of the 14 15 fisheries resource. 16 There is Angelina again. (Laughter.) 17 So I guess with that --18 19 MS. WENZEL: Yes. Thank you very much, Jim. We're going to move to the next presentation 20 and then we'll take questions. 21

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. WOODS: Yes, okay.

MR. HATCH: Again, my name is Dave Hatch. I'm a former tribal council member. I've served, oh, about eight years on council over the last 25 years. And I had the good fortune of not getting re-elected in February, so I got my life back.

I'm a full-time engineer with the city of Portland, and it has been real helpful for me to kind of get things back in order in my life by not trying to work two full-time jobs. But that's typical of folks who are involved in tribal activities. We really do wear nine hats.

And the Tribal Chairman, Dee Pigsley, had asked me to come here and represent the tribe, so I am representing the Confederated Tribes of Siletz. And I'm also representing myself, and you will I think hear a diverse opinion on some stuff today.

I want to go over history. The history is important. We're still in Oregon celebrating what we call the Louis and Clark

NEAL R. GROSS

Bicentennial. The inside joke, tribal folks they refer to them as "Clueless and Lark."

(Laughter.)

We should celebrate Alexander McKinsey. Anybody from Canada knows that. He crossed Canada in 75 days, crossed 1,200 miles. He -- of unexplained territory, but he used Indian guides all the way through.

He went to today's town of Bella Cula, and met up with some folks. He was actually given a robe made out of two sea otter skins there. And while he was there, George Vancouver's mapping expedition was in today's town of Bella Bella, and they roughed up the people and were breaking into their houses and things like that.

And then, they left and then McKinsey's guides went down to Bella Bella and came back, quickly reported that a larger group was on their way to shoot their arrows and hurl their spears at us. So Alexander McKinsey packed up his canoes wisely and headed back. He never actually made it out into the open Pacific Ocean.

NEAL R. GROSS

But when they loaded up their canoes, one of his crew members lighted a piece of tobacco with a magnifying glass, and the locals were impressed by that and traded one of their sea otter skins for that magnifying glass. So he

came back with a robe and a skin, and those

articles ended up in this guy's hands.

So he was the President of the American -- let's see. I'm sorry, I forgot the name. Yes, American Philosophical Society at the time. And he was very aware of the sea otter trade. He was a very educated, very aware guy, and he had actually tried three times prior to the Lewis and Clark expedition to propel an expedition across the United States, including sending John Ledgerd backwards.

Ledgerd was supposed -- who he had met in Europe. Ledgerd had sailed with Captain Cooke, but Ledgerd was going to walk across Russia, hop on a ship, one of the trading ships, and land on the west coast, and then walk from the west coast to the east coast.

NEAL R. GROSS

Well, when Jefferson became President, he acquired McKinsey's journals, he -- and knew all about how to get across. He acquired Vancouver's maps. He had the lower -- maps that included the lower 100 miles of the Columbia River, and so this voyage of discovery knew a lot about where they were going.

But in -- Jefferson was very interested in acquiring as much Indian land as he could, and he had run into issues acquiring that land, and so you -- when you read his January 18th letter to Congress, his secret message to Congress, he talks about trying to acquire that land and states that experience and reflection will develop to the Indians, the wisdom of exchanging what they can spare, and we want for what we want -- for what we can spare and they want.

He's trying to get the Indians interested in farming. So I got a kick out of Scott McMullen's comments earlier. I hope that Scott McMullen will read some Wendall Barry.

NEAL R. GROSS

(Laughter.)

And trying to get the Indians to basically change their way of living.

When he sent Lewis and Clark out there, his letter to them stated that, "Should you reach the Pacific Ocean, inform yourself of the circumstances which may decide whether further furs of these parts may not be collected as advantageously as at Nipika Sound," which is where the sea otter trade was going on.

Seven hundred fifty days after they started, 10 times longer than McKinsey, this government-sponsored expedition made it to the west coast. On November 20, 1805, they came across a Chinook Indian on the other side of the river from Astoria, today's town of Astoria, wearing a sea otter robe. The only thing he would trade that sea otter robe for was Sacajawea's belt that had blue beads on it, and that was the first sea otter that they acquired.

They acquired a second robe in today's town of Ridgefield near Vancouver,

NEAL R. GROSS

Washington, on their way back. But in Oregon they were never able to afford any of the robes or -- that they came across. But they were able to acquire a couple of individual skins.

Those skins, in the early letters back to Jefferson, Lewis and Clark say that they're bringing these materials back, but they never made it to Jefferson. They're just lost in history.

When you read about -- after Lewis took his life, the very first accounting of his possessions included one finely dressed sea otter skin, and every subsequent accounting of his possessions does not include that sea otter skin.

Again, it disappeared.

Okay. After they left -- they left in 1806, the Russians came through. The Russians were working their way up and down the coast because they had established Fort Ross in 1810. There wasn't a lot of interaction with the Oregon tribal folks. Most of the folks lived along the estuaries. And up on the screen are the names

NEAL R. GROSS

of different tribal groups, and you recognize as river names.

People lived along the estuaries, like the Yaquina. I can take you out here and show you why there's tribal fish -- tidal fish weirs out here. And those fish weirs were the primary source of food for the people. And quoting from one of the -- from Andy Minor Peterson, everybody could have all they wanted.

of the same school or run of fish out in the river or bay. The swarming waters were limitless in their bounty, and that was all year long. That's not just the salmon. Salmon, you know, are important, but they're -- all fish were important.

Okay. In 1844, James Polk was elected President. He's the 5440 or fight president that you guys remember from your history classes. June of 1846, the British government agreed with the United States government that this land belonged to the United States.

NEAL R. GROSS

August of 1848, after the Whitman Massacre, Congress remembered that it needed to create a government for the new Oregon territory. In 1850, Congress passed the Oregon Donation Land Act, which opened western Oregon to settlement. After that Act was passed, Congress remembered that the land was occupied, so Congress authorized Commissioners to negotiate with the tribes.

The first treaty was negotiated by Joel Palmer, September 10, 1853. That was the Rogue River Treaty down in southern Oregon. That was negotiated because the -- there was conflict going on with the native people and the gold miners in the area. And then, you can see the -- and the map, different times, different treaties.

Palmer works his way north. Some of those treaties were ratified. The Rogue River Treaty was ratified by Congress on April 12, 1854. What happened is eventually all of the tribes ended up where you are today, on the Oregon Coast

NEAL R. GROSS

Reservation, established in 1855 by Executive Order by Franklin Pierce.

Right after it was established, the -- for the coast Willapa and Umpqua tribes, it became the policy of the government to relocate the treaty tribes of the Rogue Valley tribes to the coast reservation. So there are treaties associated with this reservation.

And then, there's a small map at the bottom to give you a perspective of what -- how much of Oregon -- they have about a third of the Oregon cost, about 20 miles wide.

Okay. This land right here, right in here. So that's about two miles north, and a few miles east of here, that's where our tribal government is.

Andrew Johnson, on December 21, 1865, upon the request of whites to open the Yaquina estuary for exploitation of native oysters. Just signed an Executive Order opening up 200,000 acres. The Superintendent of Indian Affairs -- you can look at his diary -- he wrote,

NEAL R. GROSS

"The tract is thrown open to settlement. The whites rushed in upon the tract, seizing -- seized upon the Indian farms, occupied their houses, in several instances ejecting the Indians who had built the houses by force, and immediately commenced settlement of the country."

In 1975, after we had lost that middle quarter of our reservation, Congress was petitioned by the Oregon legislature to open up the northern quarter and the southern quarter of the reservation, and Congress passed an act stating that the Indians shall not be removed from their present reservation without their consent previously had.

And then, again, reading from the Superintendent of Indian Affair's journals, in 1875, the Tillamook and Kanasi (phonetic) bands were forcibly removed with no prior consent during the heavy winter rains, and left without shelter of any kind, and destitute of food and clothing for themselves, and their family suffering from heavy rain and windstorms. Those

NEAL R. GROSS

1 of you from along the Washington coast familiar with that type of weather we've got here. 2 In 1892, we had that last one quarter 3 of our reservation, and four-fifths of that was 4 removed by a process called allotment. 5 hundred fifty-one tribal members were given 80 6 7 acres with the promise that other -- other members in the future would also have access to land, 8 but they were never given that access. 9 10 And they were -- that was supposed to be upon the consent of the tribe. The consensus 11 of the tribe was never received. 12 13 Okay. Again, right here, in 1906, Joe Priest and Frank Biggs killed the last native 14 sea otter on the Oregon coast, 100 years ago, 15 and 100 years after Lewis and Clark left. 16 In 1910, there were less than 30 sea 17 otters killed in the Pacific. In 1910, an orphan 18 19 from the Aleut people up in Alaska was sent to the Chemawa Indian school. That's my grandfather, 20 Nick Hatch. 21

In 1910, there's a census of the

people along the Satsop River south of here. There were nine surviving Satsop people. Prior to that, about 2,500 people were estimated to be living along the river.

In 1914, two of those adults died, and my grandmother, Hattie Martin, was left an orphan. And so as a -- I think she was 11 years old. She went to Chemawa Indian school and met my grandfather. So what we see is that the tribal populations are pretty much following the same pattern that the sea otter was following.

There were two major runs of disease that came through here, and each one of them wiped out about 90 percent of the population. So the population was very much decimated when Lewis and Clark were out here, and then -- and subsequent to that there was another round of disease that came through.

In 1911, the census estimated that there were between 500 and 1,000 surviving sea otter in 13 small colonies, and so the sea otter were included in the 1911 fur seal treaty as an

NEAL R. GROSS

afterthought.

In 1912, the federal Department of Agriculture came through and mapped all the kelp beds from California all the way up to Alaska for potential exploitations for pot ash. We're right here in Aquinnah Bay, and there were large kelp beds all along from here to Aquinnah Head, the lighthouse, and then north of there.

Here's a posed photo of the 1920s, looking for sea otter. The last one was killed in 1906. By this time, most of the tribal members had lost their allotted lands because they couldn't pay the taxes. We were kicked off the rivers. My Dad used to run gill nets on the river, and he was running them at night with padded oarlocks, but then couldn't do that anymore. And we were also kicked off of our fish weirs by being translocated from different parts of Oregon up to the coast reservation.

Then, the final blow came back when the stars lined up. We had a Republican President and a Republican Congress and a Republican Senate,

NEAL R. GROSS

kind of like today. And August 13, 1954, the Federal Government determined that the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians no longer existed. All western Oregon tribes were terminated, and that was the Federal Government's way of dealing with the Indian problem in Oregon.

In the 1970s, we blew up parts of Chick Island and the sea otter there. And the sea otter were protected, so they were translocated down to the Oregon coast, Washington, and Vancouver Island.

In 1977, the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians was the second tribe in the United States that was restored, the second terminated tribe that was restored. Today we're about 4,300 people.

Those three populations of sea otter that were restored -- Vancouver Island, that population is about 3,000 animals, plus in Washington, in 2004, I believe there were 743 animals, and then there's -- there has been sighting of one animal, and we need to talk to

NEAL R. GROSS

Roy. Maybe there's more sightings. But in Oregon, the translocation of sea otter to Oregon did not work.

We know that the sea ofter are critical. We believe that if they can restore an effective predator for the macro algae that we will get the macro algae back and we can -- if we get the macro algae back, we'll get a healthy salmon population again.

The salmon come out of our estuaries, the Macaw people know the salmon come out, and they are -- they go out and they hide in the kelp beds. And then, when they're -- when they feed in the kelp beds, then when they come back as large fish, again, they hide in the kelp beds from their predators as large fish.

Dr. Jane Watson at the Vancouver Island, professor at Malaspina University, does research in the summer. She is a full-time teaching professor. She doesn't get to publish her research, but she has watched areas where the sea otter come back. And after the macro

NEAL R. GROSS

algae have come back, she has measured a five-fold increase in the density of fish after the urchin barrens are replaced with macro algae.

We know that the macro algae populations can come back. The beds were measured by Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife from 1996 to 1999, and a tremendous comeback of the kelp was demonstrated, but the cause was not demonstrated. They were not able to associate their findings with the urchin populations, but the fishermen hammering the urchin were populations at that location at that time and prior to that.

So we think that restoring the near shore ecosystems will be the key to restoring our estuary fisheries. Again, quoting from Melba Jacobs, "I finally learned that the men made prodigious hauls when one run or another fish came in. Then, everybody went and got all he or she needed. The go help yourself, free for all, that was actually the largest single source for the larger" -- he didn't realize that. He

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

thought that the -- he was out here in the '30s, and people weren't actively using the fish weirs.

But the the fishweir, and down on the Coquille River -- and the Coquille Tribe is doing research on that fishweir -- the other -- the one in black and white is the one that was used by my great-grandfather. It's on the north fork of the Syosta River, and just upstream of there is where all of my family is buried. But that fishweir includes mill bumber, which was available at the time my great-grandfather was there. So I'm confident that he was using that one.

The Confederate Tribes of Siletz has joined efforts -- joining in efforts with the group that we formed called the Alotka Alliance, which includes Oregon Coast Aquarium, Eco-Marine Science Center, Oregon State University, Portland State University, Oregon Institute of Marine Biology, Siletz Tribe, Coquille Tribe, and we're all supporting efforts to try to restore the sea otter and the near shore ecosystems on

NEAL R. GROSS

the Oregon coast.

We published letters in our tribal newspapers that have been picked up by local newspapers. One exciting project we did was we extracted -- we took the sea otter bones that we find in our middens, they're the second most common marine mammal bone in middens up and down the Oregon coast.

We extracted the DNA and figured out that the efforts to bring the northern subspecies down to Oregon was a mistake, that the appropriate subspecies to bring to Oregon we believe is the southern sea otter, which folks know is a listed threatened species. So what we've got to do is figure out a way to effectively do that, and we hope to do that.

We prepared and taught a curriculum on sea otter and the Oregon coast. That went really well. And we haven't published that yet; we're short of money, short of time.

We proposed, prior to the Governor's efforts, the creation of what we call the White

NEAL R. GROSS

Cedar National Marine Sanctuary, specifically for the purpose of restoring near shore macro algae. And our proposal was that would run from the south jetty of the Umpqua River down to the Rogue Reef. We think that this is an area where the -- we could successfully begin restoring the algae populations and trying to restore the ecosystems associated with those.

So we hope that 100 years after Lewis and Clark -- we know that 100 years after Lewis and Clark left the last sea otter was killed in Oregon. One hundred years later, roughly, there was a sea otter sighting down in Cape Arago. Some of you who are familiar with the sea otter can recognize that as a sea otter. His paws are up in the -- are pointed up. Red otter don't do that when they go out in the ocean.

But anyhow, the whole purpose of this is so that I hope that my grandson or great-grandson will be able to do what my great-grandfather did, and we'll be able to go out on our estuaries and harvest in a sustainable

NEAL R. GROSS

manner the tidal fish weirs, the fish come in, trapped in a pool of water behind the stakes, you go down and you take what you need, don't take any more than that, and the tide comes in and those fish are on their way to do what they are supposed to do.

So we really do hope that the tribes of the -- in Oregon will be able to work with the State of Oregon. The State of Oregon has a horrible racist history, and it's -- it's one of those little known things, but we're trying real hard to cooperate with the state.

We've had a lot of problems with the state. And one of the questions earlier was: what is the advantage of involving the Federal Government in a state process? Well, our experience as a tribe has been that the Federal Government really can't help us where the state is trying to hurt us.

So I think the same may be true for the marine protected areas. It's the -- my experience, I actually sat on the Ocean Policy

NEAL R. GROSS

1	Advisory Council for a couple of years, and never
2	really had a chance to voice what I voiced with
3	you today. And if you look at kind of the
4	stumbling that we were talking about on the Oregon
5	Policy Advisory Council, they really are
6	following one of my Murphy's laws. "If you don't
7	want to do something, any excuse will do."
8	So it's I don't believe that's,
9	at this point, a very effective group. And I
10	hope that changes over time. Diverse opinion.
11	Thank you.
12	CHAIR BROMLEY: Thank you very much.
13	Dave and Jim, where are you? Jim?
14	We have some time. We'll take some
15	time for questions, if there are any. Comments?
15 16	time for questions, if there are any. Comments? So let's let's hear from people. Yes, Mike?
16	So let's let's hear from people. Yes, Mike?
16 17	So let's let's hear from people. Yes, Mike? DR. CRUICKSHANK: (Inaudible comment from an unmiked location.)
16 17 18	So let's let's hear from people. Yes, Mike? DR. CRUICKSHANK: (Inaudible comment
16 17 18	So let's let's hear from people. Yes, Mike? DR. CRUICKSHANK: (Inaudible comment from an unmiked location.) CHAIR BROMLEY: Dennis, and then I

us through the shared history we have that we can all learn from. I'm just curious to know whether the native tribes of the northwest had a history of -- in their culture of protecting the areas in the manner that we think about marine protected areas, or, you know, that occur in some other native cultures around the world, such as the Polynesians.

MR. HATCH: The easy example is the sea otter. There weren't that many sea otter up and down the Oregon cost, and yet we coexisted with them for thousands and thousands of years.

And the -- only the headmen wore the sea otter robes. And the hunt of the -- you know, was managed. Only select people got to -- got to wear the robes, and we knew better than to go out and take them off. I honestly believe that our elders knew how to manage the ecosystem.

The seals that went up river were fair game. We knew that they were the ones that were hammering the salmon that went upriver. So we don't have -- we didn't have the problem of the

NEAL R. GROSS

conflict that we have today with the seals and sea lions upriver, the salmon populations.

The most common marine mammal bone in different parts of Oregon related to the seal or the sea lion -- they were effectively harvested. You know, I agree with Scott's comments that man does need to be involved in the management of marine protected areas.

If I could just make a MR. WOODS: point here. I know I talked in my presentation about some of the lengths that we strive and the efforts that make in managing todav's we fisheries with the tribes. Well, that's -- throughout our history, as stewards and managers of our resource, we've -- like you've mentioned, you know, you only take what you need. been a philosophy, you know, And that's throughout time with the tribes in the northwest.

I know that, you know, there is many different instances in our culture where, you know, we've worked with, you know, or worked on the rivers as far as the migratory patterns, you

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	know, only taking, you know, a certain amount
2	of those stocks. But that's just it's part
3	of the whole culture and keeping in balance.
4	The Macaw believe that we're part
5	of part of this food chain. You know, we don't
6	look at the food chain from a distance. We're
7	within that food chain.
8	CHAIR BROMLEY: Thank you. Gil? Gil
9	Radonski?
LO	MR. RADONSKI: Thank you for a great
11	presentation and sharing your history with us.
L2	It's an honor to hear it.
L3	And my question is for Jim, and first
L4	a comment. Jim, you don't need Toastmasters.
15	(Laughter.)
L6	Your presentation was very effective,
L7	especially the parts where you didn't even speak
18	and just showed series of pictures. I thought
L9	it was very dramatic. So thank you.
20	MR. WOODS: Thank you.
21	MR. RADONSKI: My question is, as
22	co-managers of the resource, do you subscribe

1	to the premise that we have for marine protected
2	areas concerning natural heritage, cultural
3	heritage, and sustainable production? Is that
4	part of your thought process as co-managers
5	for as we proceed with this MPA effort?
6	MR. WOODS: Well, I haven't
7	been really been able to wrap myself around
8	some of the language used. And I know that it's
9	a direction that I'm going to work towards. When
10	we look at these different definitions I know
11	I've talked to Joel about this what's the
12	cultural definition, you know, cultural and
13	historic definitions that are identified, you
14	know, in this realm thus far with shipwrecks or,
15	you know, historic sites.
16	Well, I believe that it goes further
17	than that, and, you know, when we when we think
18	of cultural or historic, think of us, and our
19	cultures and our people and where we've derived
20	from as stewards and managers.
21	MR. RADONSKI: I agree with that.

I think that your visions of cultural heritage,

which you made very clear, probably go to a much greater depth than what we commonly think of cultural heritage. And I think the explanation of the stewardship responsibilities of the Indians through history, the tribal leaders, etcetera, not taking more than they needed, I think that is the nexus of sustainable production.

So I think, just from reading it in our -- the way we have it on paper, intuitively you people do subscribe to these three factors, and probably to a greater depth with regard to the cultural heritage than we do. So I think we've learned something here from your telling us about your cultural heritage and how it impacts your lives and is your reason for managing the resource.

So I enjoyed it. My question was really, as far as I'm concerned, was quite rhetoric, because I think you have answered it. But I did want to make it a point that why we have these presentations is to broaden our

NEAL R. GROSS

knowledge on some of these things. So thank you again.

MR. WOODS: I think that some of the points that I want to make are not to give everyone a warm and fuzzy feeling inside. I think it's important to understand where we come from in our culture, in our heritage, but it's also just as important to understand the lengths that we strive today as managers.

And, you know, today we practice more science in my state -- try to practice more science than -- than the State of Washington, or the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary combined.

We really work hard to assure that some day little Angelina will be able to go to the river and, you know, catch a fish for a meal or for our children in the future to be able to provide, you know, economically for their families. It's quite -- it's very much a part of who we are. So the work that we do today is guaranteeing that we're not depleting the stocks.

NEAL R. GROSS

1 CHAIR BROMLEY: Yes. Bob Zales?

MR. ZALES: Yes. Thank you, all. It was an excellent presentation. My daughter is adopted, and she's got a good percentage of Seminole Indian in her from Florida. And two things for you I guess, because you mentioned tribes in Florida.

But since I've been involved with MPAs, and I've learned about all the tribal connections and what not with fisheries out here in the northwest, I've asked a lot of people a lot of questions in the State of Florida -- where is this -- because you've got a big Indian heritage in the State Of florida.

Is there any connection with any treaties or anything for any of these fishing rights in Florida that you know of, or -- because nobody has been able to tell me anything about this.

MR. WOODS: Many of the treaties throughout the whole country incorporate U&A and hunting and fishing rights, if not all treaties

NEAL R. GROSS

do, to some certain degree. The treaties up here in the northwest are unique, and then there's a few treaties in the Great Lakes that are just as unique and encompassing marine waters.

So when I talk about the four coastal tribes in Washington, we're -- our U&A, that reaches out 40, 50, 60 miles out into the Pacific, encompasses state waters. We have -- the Olympic Coast national marine sanctuary is actually within tribal U&A. So there is a uniqueness about the northwest here.

Okay. MR. ZALES: And my next question is: in the current proposal that's out for it talks about tribal MPA comment, authorities programs and linkages, and it appears that this isn't enough recognition or authority for the tribe. So my question is: does this satisfy you all's needs, or what is it that you would add to this to enhance that?

MR. WOODS: Well, we're going to be -- I'm going to be sitting down with my counterparts and the Northwest Indian Fisheries

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	Commission, the coastal tribes, and we still have
2	a little bit of ways to go, and I think we're
3	going to formulate a few comments on that proposed
4	document. But there is nothing really that I
5	want to address right now.
6	MR. ZALES: Thank you.
7	CHAIR BROMLEY: Thank you. Dennis,
8	you're
9	DR. HEINEMANN: You already got me.
10	CHAIR BROMLEY: I got you. Okay.
11	John Ogden, and then I think we should terminate
12	it.
13	DR. OGDEN: Well, let me add my thanks
14	to both of you for an inspiring presentation.
15	It was very educational.
16	Jim, I just have a quick question for
17	you. Those of us who are sort of struggling with
18	the concept of ecosystem-based management hear
19	quite a bit about the and I don't have the
20	name quite right, the Puget Sound Partnership
21	group of stakeholders that's getting together

to sort of try to come to some resolution on the

1	management of the entire Puget Sound, Georgia
2	Strait, even connecting with the Willamette
3	Valley and all that as a as a large ecosystem.
4	Can you can you comment on that?
5	How is that process going? And do you feel that
6	concerns of that you've articulated here are
7	fulfilled in that process?
8	MR. WOODS: Fran, do you want to kind
9	of help me with this?
10	MS. WILSHUSEN: No, we don't. The
11	Puget Sound partnership is a new process. The
12	tribes are participating, but it's very much a
13	state process, so a lot of the kinds of the issues
14	that Jim brought out in his presentation and
15	David, too we're working through with that
16	process as well.
17	Chairman Frank, who is the Chairman
18	of the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission,
19	is one of the three co-chairs of the Puget Sound
20	partnership. That was done as an afterthought.
21	It was originally Bill Ruckle's house and Jay
22	Manning, who is the Director of Department of

Ecology.

And the tribes came very much forward and said Puget Sound, I mean, add up just the coastline that the tribal governments have jurisdiction over, let alone the -- that all of Puget Sound is part of some tribe's U&A. So there's no part of Puget Sound that isn't -- doesn't have tribal fisheries management over it.

And the Governor -- Christine Gregoire -- who has a long-time relationship with the tribes, both as Department of Ecology Director and now as Governor -- quickly backstepped and asked Billy to be one of the co-chairs.

The process has been long, it's difficult, and it's very much a state process, and they have a hard time stepping out of that state ownership and really opening up what's going to be required to everybody there. And so we're hopeful. The tribes are fully participating, but, you know, you don't know

NEAL R. GROSS

where that's going to go.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIR BROMLEY: Okay. Lelei, you -- where are you? Oh, there you are. Okay.

And then, that will be the end of it, I think.

MR. PEAU: Lelei Peau. Jim and Dave, thank you for the history and a reminder to this body in terms of the importance of recognition of traditional knowledge in our -- in our work.

I was fascinated with the -- Jim, with your presentation about going back and asking the questions about the legacy that needs to be continued, and how that applied to how the tribes work towards ensuring that the future of the resources is maintained and can be shared with the -- with future generations.

I want to -- I want to ask a question on your experience on the co-managers -- co-management of the resources. The draft framework -of the goals one highlighted the enhancement and effective coordination between federal, state, and local Perhaps you did cover it in your government.

NEAL R. GROSS

presentation, but if you can explain a little bit about you did mention something about how the federal is helping with your efforts, and the state is not.

And I can appreciate the frustration, because, again, it is the same -- same challenge that we face in the Islands where we're so remote, we're so far away, we're out of sight, out of mind. And oftentimes we are forgotten.

National policies -- I know the intent is to enhance. The incentive is to have the resources -- the financial resources to help facilitate and promote the work that you do. But oftentimes that resource is not enough to be shared among all of the jurisdictions. So, again, you're back to the same dilemma.

But one thing that I think we need to be mindful of the fact that our national policies can only be effective if they are applicable at all levels -- national, regional, and local communities. Can you explain a little bit in terms of what the problem is with the state

NEAL R. GROSS

and what suggestions or recommendations you can offer given the framework that is being proposed?

Does this help address the concern or the challenge that you encounter in your effort? What can you -- what can you bring to the table? Thank you.

MR. WOODS: Well, we are continually working on, you know, perfecting our relationship with the state. Since 1974, through that Bolt decision, whether we liked it or not, or whether the state liked it or not, we became partners. And, you know, we've had our highs and -- ups and downs.

We've established a good working relationship with the state to date, and with this -- with our committee, I'm on Committee 1, and I put together a paper on, you know, an example or a case study of the relationship between the tribes as co-managers and the State of Washington and how that intricately plays within the nymphs as well.

So we all know and understand our

NEAL R. GROSS

roles, but it's a continual negotiation process.

It's a process that we're dealing with the state on fishery-related issues. It's my job as a policy representative for the tribe to hold people or hold these agencies accountable where there -- you know, it's forest and -- you know, forestry, you know, management practices, that's regulated and overseen by the state, or whether it's the Department of Transportation in culverts, you know, and road construction, in non-point

source water runoff issues.

So we do run into issues like that that affects our U&A or our -- you know, because our U&A reaches far off -- off of the reservation outside of our boundaries. But still, we have this dotted line out there that extends and encompasses a good portion of the peninsula. And within those areas, we do run into, you know, mismanagement issues with the state.

CHAIR BROMLEY: Fine. How strongly do you feel about it, Tony, about your own question?

NEAL R. GROSS

1	DR. CHATWIN: I feel strongly about
2	it.
3	(Laughter.)
4	CHAIR BROMLEY: Okay. This will be
5	the last one. Please, short question and short
6	answer.
7	DR. CHATWIN: Thanks for the
8	presentation. I'm going to be brief. I just
9	wanted to the U&A areas, because they as
10	I have am understanding this, they are
11	co-management areas, right? Do they enjoy a
12	certain status with the federal agencies that
13	you co-manage with?
14	MR. WOODS: Well, the usual and the
15	custom area is an area that's identified in our
16	treaty fight, a guaranteed area that we have the
17	right to enter and fish or hunt. You know,
18	primarily, that's what the meaning of a U&A is,
19	you know, when we talk about our treaty rights.
20	When I talk about co-management with
21	the state, that's something that we take 50
22	percent of any allocated stock of salmon, and

then the tribes within that 50 percent, through the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, will allocate according to history and catch -- catch history per tribe what portion of that 50 percent they will receive.

The Macaw Tribe -- we're the biggest treaty fishery tribe in the United States. And I say "treaty tribe," guaranteed right to fish tribe. And so typically in western Washington we'll take the lion's share of that allocation.

Real quick, I just wanted to mention a few weeks ago we had the honor of hosting a very important meeting with the chairs of all 13 sanctuaries at Macaw in Neha Bay, and it was quite an experience. We were able to entertain them. They took turns riding in ocean-going whaling canoes. We feasted on salmon and seafood, and they toured our museum. And I'd like to extend that some day to this group if -- you know, we'd be happy to host a fact meeting in Indian country.

CHAIR BROMLEY: I thought we are in Indian country.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	MR. WOODS: Well, we are, but
2	(Laughter.)
3	CHAIR BROMLEY: I know what you mean,
4	but we're there, aren't we? Everywhere we go,
5	we're in Indian country, aren't we?
6	MR. WOODS: Yes, pretty much.
7	CHAIR BROMLEY: Yes. Okay. Thank
8	you.
9	(Applause.)
10	Wonderful. Thank you.
11	We've already had our break, so we're
12	going to push ahead here.
13	The breaks will be ad hoc. If we take
14	a break, we it's 20 minutes. Let me ask
15	Jim Jim Woods, before you get away, I wanted
16	to ask you about the statement that you
17	distributed. And in terms of your work on
18	Subcommittee 1, we have invited the subcommittees
19	to look at the framework document and to come
20	back to this committee with ideas about it. And
21	Subcommittee 3 particularly is doing that.

And I want to ask you, in terms of

1	Subcommittee 1, the statement that you
2	distributed here, on page 2 you have a general
3	assessment clause. Have you managed in your
4	Subcommittee 1 to reach the point where maybe
5	the number 1 Subcommittee would come back to us
6	with some of this language?
7	MR. WOODS: Let me see what document
8	we're looking at.
9	CHAIR BROMLEY: Well, that's this
10	thing.
11	MR. WOODS: The MPA
12	CHAIR BROMLEY: It's the letter you
13	sent to Donald.
14	MR. WOODS: Right.
15	CHAIR BROMLEY: One opportunity would
16	be for you and your Subcommittee 1 to propose
17	to us some language like this, because it's
18	clearly within the province of Subcommittee 1,
19	isn't it?
20	PARTICIPANT: I don't think the Court
21	Reporter can hear us.
22	CHAIR BROMLEY: She can't hear?

1	PARTICIPANT: Oh. Oh, we need one
2	conversation.
3	CHAIR BROMLEY: There's too many
4	meetings going on in the room. Is that what you're
5	saying? Yes. Okay. We are still in session,
6	and I believe there is one meeting going on up
7	here.
8	So my question to you, Jim, is: would
9	you and Subcommittee 1 be interested
10	perhaps have you discussed this in
11	Subcommittee 1?
12	MR. WOODS: No, we haven't discussed
13	it as of yet. But that is
14	CHAIR BROMLEY: Let me just say that,
15	speaking, you know, as Chair of the FAC, we would
16	be open to receiving from Subcommittee 1 some
17	language that resembles this and consider it for
18	action, just as we're going to consider some
19	changes from Subcommittee 3. Okay?
20	MR. WOODS: Okay.
21	CHAIR BROMLEY: And you guys have some
22	time to meet, and so I would I think what I'm

1 trying to do is invite you to discuss with 2 Subcommittee 1 this sense of your group. MR. WOODS: Okay. Yes. 3 CHAIR BROMLEY: Tony? 4 5 DR. CHATWIN: Yes. Just a suggestion that while -- during the presentation I was going 6 7 through the draft framework to look references to the content of this letter, not 8 that they referred to that letter specifically, 9 10 but the suggestion I would make is Subcommittee 1, for Jim and Subcommittee 1 to 11 do the same, because there is a lot of language 12 13 in here that seems to reflect a lot of the intent in the letter. But I'm not a good person to judge 14 15 that. I just think that there are places in the document that already make reference to it. 16 Now that I have the mike again, did 17 you get a response to your letter, from this 18 19 letter here that you distributed?

MR. WOODS: This was distributed by a committee group with the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission.

NEAL R. GROSS

20

21

1	DR. CHATWIN: In '03.
2	MR. WOODS: Yes, back in '03.
3	DR. CHATWIN: You've never
4	MR. WOODS: No, the Macaw we
5	actually had an addendum to this, and so there
6	is
7	MS. WILSHUSEN: Yes, just by way of
8	background, in 2003, the 20 tribes in western
9	Washington recognized that this idea of MPAs was
10	coming, it was coming at every level. And while
11	they pride themselves on their conservation, the
12	marine conservation priority, the idea of these
13	MPAs was, like it is to many, concerning to them
14	for the potential restriction on their harvest
15	activities. So this policy was an attempt to
16	take a front end jump at if you're going to do
17	it, please do it like this.
18	MR. WOODS: That's right. That's
19	right.
20	MS. WILSHUSEN: And the Macaws made
21	one. We'll get that out to you, but it's an
22	addendum to that that is very focused on their

particular area.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIR BROMLEY: Okay. I see that Max -- I mean, I see that the Chair and the Vice Chair of Subcommittee 1 were probably out of the room when I engaged you in this question. is back. Max -- when Max comes back -- Bob, what I raised with Jim, with respect to Subcommittee 1, which is concerned with, what, regional issues and cooperation, and so on, that it would be quite appropriate if the subcommittee was so inclined to come back to us before we adjourn tomorrow with a sense of this sort of statement that's at the bottom of page 2 in their submission, so that as we've invited Subcommittee 3 to come to us with ideas for improving the framework document, Subcommittee 1 could do the same with respect to this statement at the bottom of page 2 and the letter that he distributed.

MR. ZALES: That's the reason why I asked him the question, that -- what is in the framework. What would he suggest to be -- I mean, is that okay, or what additional comments would

NEAL R. GROSS

1	he suggest to go in there?
2	CHAIR BROMLEY: And my
3	suggestion here comes Max. My suggestion is
4	that Subcommittee 1 could look at this general
5	paragraph at the bottom of page 2 in what Jim
6	handed out and assess to what extent the framework
7	reflects this.
8	MR. WOODS: Mr. Chairman, if
9	appropriate, I'd like to encourage all three
10	committees to review this document and utilize
11	it where best available.
12	CHAIR BROMLEY: Okay. Yes, Joe?
13	MR. URAVITCH: Yes. I just wanted
14	to note someone raised the question as to whether
15	this letter was ever responded to. It was
16	responded to in a general way by the Secretary
17	of Commerce. We always respond to incoming
18	correspondence.
19	But what it also said was we were at
20	the beginning of a process which has now resulted
21	in a framework, so we're now and this was part
22	of our consideration in putting together the

1	framework and we will consider it further.
2	CHAIR BROMLEY: Yes. Good. Lelei?
3	MR. PEAU: Mr. Chairman, can we get
4	a copy of the official response to this letter?
5	MR. WOODS: Yes.
6	MR. PEAU: All right. Thank you.
7	CHAIR BROMLEY: Okay. The agenda has
8	been modified just a bit. We've slipped some,
9	but that's fine. Subcommittee 3 has suggested
10	that they would like to hold off on their
11	submission to us, their report to us, until after
12	lunch. So that means that before lunch we
13	have we have only to hear from Subcommittees
14	1 and 2, and my brief little presentation. So
15	with your permission, I'd like to proceed with
16	that.
17	I had asked for a little spot on the
18	agenda and had planned to sort of turn the chair
19	over to Bonnie, so that I it was clear that
20	I was not speaking as Chair, but as a mere member.
21	Mere, right?

Bonnie is not here, and so I don't

know what to do. I will turn over the Chair to Lauren perhaps. I would like it to be very clear that I'm speaking now not as your Chairman but as just somebody interested in this process. And I asked for a chance to share with you some ideas and lessons that I picked up in August while I was visiting both the marine protected areas people in New Zealand and the Great Barrier Marine Park in Australia.

So with your goodwill, I will try to keep this brief. What I have to talk to you about is simply my impression. It is not the official view of anything.

Let me just talk about New Zealand briefly and Australia briefly. From a policy kind of perspective, New Zealand has -- and I want to talk about governance treaty issues, because they touch on what we face here. New Zealand has, for those of you that know, a very strict sort of Westminster system of governance where a parliament speaks with one voice.

New Zealand is jurisdictionally

NEAL R. GROSS

challenged. That is to say, they have no states, they have no layering of government like we have, so what you have in New Zealand is a Parliament and a native community that is -- that has become increasingly involved in governance, since the white people realized that they had a treaty with the Maori in 1840.

And so what you have in New Zealand is a powerful Parliament and a powerful native community with clear treaty rights with a treaty from the tribunal. And so this is very different from what we have here, and it's very different from what one encounters in Australia to be sure.

New Zealand has -- and I -- my apologies to those of you who know about New Zealand and Australia better than I. I'm sure that some of you do. But New Zealand has taken a representative areas approach. They have tried to identify by regions.

They have tried to find representative habitat types, so in a sense New Zealand has approached it the way I think our

NEAL R. GROSS

early interest in MPAs did. Let's find bioregions that are unique, let's identify them, let's quantify them, and let's designate them as marine reserves, marine protected areas.

To qualify the New Zealand system, they must be under some level of protection that allows recovery. And then, there's a list of accepted sites that it has put together, and then the government goes around and makes sure that all representative sites have been covered. And if they haven't, they identify that as a gap, and they go out and they try to find representative areas.

So the government of New Zealand has made a commitment to find at least one example of each habitat or ecosystem to be included in marine reserve. Now, the debate, of course, is how you define a representative system, and what have you. But this is sort of the New Zealand approach, and that's all I want to say about it right now. I want to contrast it with what I think I picked up in Australia, and then we can

NEAL R. GROSS

discuss if you want for a few minutes the lessons.

Australia, I would say, is a system that is backing into zoning. So New Zealand approached it very explicitly up front. Australia has I think reluctantly backed into what Gail Osherenko yesterday reminded us about zoning.

And what I mean by "backing in,"
Australia created, as many of you know, in 1975,
the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park, with a
negative mandate. It was not created, from what
I can tell, with the noble idea of protecting
great stuff, although the reefs were regarded
as great. But it was to preclude mining, it was
to preclude drilling, and it was to preclude oil
exploration and other things in this park area.

And as many of you may know from the history, less than three percent of the area inside of the park was protected. And I went snorkeling in the area, and can tell you that when the biologists who explained the park and all of this to the tourists, told the story that

NEAL R. GROSS

only three percent of the park was protected historically, there was shock, disbelief. I mean, people -- so in a sense, people associated the idea of the park with protection.

And when they were told that only three percent of the area of the park was protected, the people that I was with on these snorkeling expeditions were outraged, shocked, surprised, what have you. Okay?

1990s, In the late then biodiversity became something that we worried about, then the Park Authority began to sort of focus on this. They went through an extensive period of identifying 70 bioregions, they developed draft zoning plans, had something like 31,000 meetings with local people, and in a sense came up with a zoning structure that now protects, whatever that means, about 34 percent of this larger area of the park.

So what -- this is what I mean by they sort of backed into zoning. They had a large area set aside as a park but with very little

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

protection. And now they're working to refine that.

Australia is jurisdictionally more complicated than New Zealand but much simpler than us. They have a state structure. They I think have fairly weak local government. I'm not quite sure about that. So you have a state-federal system that in a sense looks a bit like what we have. It's quite different from what New Zealand has. Public input was extensive.

There is a very good connection between what goes on on the land and what goes on in the park. From my sense, I think perhaps more highly developed than what we have in the U.S. The coastal area along the Great Barrier Reef is a -- is an extensive agricultural area. The sugar production there is quite astounding, so you have this connection between what goes on on the land and what happens out in the water.

And all of the efforts that the Park

Authority has taken has focused on these

agricultural towns along the coast and the agricultural activity that takes place in the -- in the watershed, and then the implications of that out in the water.

So I find the way in which the Australians have dealt with this land-water interface to be very encouraging. They produce things like this for each of these towns which I think in a sense form the political nexus of it. So here's the Cairns. We would pronounce it Karns, but the Australians pronounce it Cairns.

This is a management plan for this section of the coastline. It's an elaborate document, and they put out maps. Down here is where Steve Irwin met his untimely demise at the hands of a lurking stingray, right off the coast of Cairns. But the extensive zoning and management and public information that goes into this backing into zoning by the Great Barrier Reef thing is really quite impressive.

So are there lessons here? I think

NEAL R. GROSS

the New Zealand lesson is they paid extreme attention to, first, people's -- the Maori, not that they wanted to, but in the '80s when New Zealand was going through a massive restructuring, again, this Westminster system led them to believe that Parliament had all of this authority.

And one day the Maori stepped up and said, "Sorry, you can't sell off what you don't own." And the New Zealanders got I think an abrupt lesson in how to deal with native peoples that they had been guite happy to ignore for 100 years.

Australia, of course, is quite a different story. The Aborigines there are basically politically irrelevant. They've had a real struggle. They were impressed with our three themes for protecting areas — the idea of sustainable production, cultural resources, natural heritage. They were sort of impressed with that.

Where I think we are weak, or where I think we need more work, is a connection between

the purposes of the MPAs that we're thinking about and the levels of protection, the levels of management, the zoning if you will, that will connect these purposes with effective understanding on the part of the public of what can and cannot be done.

I think we are still fudging our terminology. This has been a constant theme when I have felt free to speak out. That's one thing I have kept hammering on. I think we have a terminological problem which does not speak clearly to the public.

When fisheries closures are called marine protected areas, and yet in our report we talk about lasting protection and permanent, I think we have a terminological issue that we have not yet developed, not yet fleshed out.

I worry that we're avoiding central issues of operational significance. I think we are -- we are sort of preoccupied with seeing about getting areas into the national system.

We have left off I think important issues about

NEAL R. GROSS

what is to be done there, what these areas ought to be called.

I think we heard this morning a story about, "Well, you're going to create all these sanctuaries, but there's no money for them." And I think the lesson from Australia is important here, and that is that I think we're afraid of, as we put it, creating paper parks. But paper parks — I don't like that term — but just the designation of a sanctuary, or the designation of an area that shall now be taken care of, has a way of stimulating interest, and money flows from that.

This is clearly the Australian lesson, that you create an area that's called a park. The public realizes, then, that there's very little protection in this park. The public becomes concerned, agitated, interested, and there is an induced response, political response to this designation, which then stimulates money.

So if I can use sort of the economic jargon, there's kind of an endogenous issue here

NEAL R. GROSS

that takes place where public awareness transfers into larger political support, and money, therefore, comes from it. So I wouldn't worry so much that there isn't money up front. I think money will flow from an identification of an area and a commitment to it.

Well, I think that's all I want to say. I think, finally, the message we just heard this morning from the tribes reminds me of a need that -- that -- for a much more explicit incorporation of first peoples interest into the MPA process. I think the Kiwis have a great start on this. The Australians do not. They claim they have tried to get first peoples involved in it, but they have a set of problems there that are so different from ours that I don't think there's much in the way of a lesson there.

So I'd be -- I'm -- I'll be quiet now.

That's my observations. Any comments? Tony?

DR. CHATWIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'd just like to make one clarification for folks
in the room, that although I agree 100 percent

NEAL R. GROSS

that there are lessons that we can learn, that this effort is not about creating areas. That we are talking about developing a national system with existing areas. But I do believe that creation of the national system has the same benefits that you described.

What I wanted to share is that, to add to the Australian example, because Australia is always touted as a great example of success.

And the Great Barrier Reef is, but that's not Australia, that's one protected area in Australia.

I had the privilege to organize or co-organize with the Brazilian Ministry of Environment a site event. And the site event was focused on development of national systems in marine protected areas, and the invited countries were Brazil, Columbia, and Australia.

And I was particularly interested in the Australia presentation, because it had this reputation of being sort of the leader in these matters. However, it was very interesting that

NEAL R. GROSS

they are now, as is every signatory to the Convention, trying to meet the commitments to develop a national system to protect theirs, including marine protected areas.

And so that means for Australia that -- it means going from having this Great Barrier Reef affected area to having other areas around the country. And they struggle -- they are struggling with exactly the same sort of issues that we are, including the funding. So right now, they have funds for this one authority to manage this one area, and I'm sure that there's collaboration and cooperation with other authorities.

But when they talk about expanding it, the question of, where is the money going to come from, is still very much one that's of primary importance. I'd just like to add that, so that we don't think that we're struggling with something that --

CHAIR BROMLEY: Okay. Well, Jim, and then Bob.

NEAL R. GROSS

DR. AGARDY: Thanks, Dan. I have a slightly different interpretation of history, which I guess is, what is it that somebody said, that history is -- you know, what happened in history is however it was written by the person who was documenting it.

So I think --

CHAIR BROMLEY: History written by the victors.

DR. AGARDY: Yes, that's right.
(Laughter.)

So I think it's wonderful that you bring forward the lessons learned from Australia and New Zealand. And I don't disagree with some of the lessons, but I -- I would like to point out that the Australian setting up of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park was a zoning exercise right from the start, that the enormous and really unparalleled resource that Australia recognized to its credit back in '86 and for which it established three zoning sections essentially, and set out to initially zone with very little

NEAL R. GROSS

full protection as you said, and with a regulation that was put into play with the establishment of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, that the zoning be revisited periodically.

So this was an opportunity for them to learn -- actually put adaptive management into play, and take stock of what was happening with the zones that they created and revisit that and rezone. In effect, they set up a system where they could sunset out fully protected areas if they deemed them not achieving the goals of the zone.

So I think they had zoning in mind right from the start, and it is true that they have increased the amount of protection in the park. But I don't think it is true that the -- even today's very extensive strict protection of the 33 percent that is now fully protected is really addressing the threats to the marine park, because what is happening is the marine environment of the Great Barrier Reef is continuing to be degraded by land-based sources

NEAL R. GROSS

of pollution.

And one of the great lessons to be learned from the Great Barrier Reef experience I think is that they never really recognized the connection between land and sea when they first set out. And as a result -- and there was a lot of, frankly, corruption in the state governments, unnamed state governments, so that there was very little ability of the parastatal organization that the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority really is to be able to control a lot of the impacts on the Great Barrier Reef.

So while they were able to regulate tourism, and able to some extent regular where fishing occurred, and to keep oil and gas industry and other kinds of mining interests out of the park, they were not able to tackle the problems of land-based sources of pollution, nor, of course, were they able to tackle the problems of climate change and other global change events, which no -- you know, no individual institution could do. So I think there are interesting

lessons to be learned from Australia.

Also, with the lack of leadership at the federal level to do what the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority did for that -- that part of Australia, they haven't been able to replicate that in other parts of the country. Instead, the states have done an amazing job in developing both representative systems of protected areas within state waters and of exploring what the idea of MPA networks really means.

So in south Australia, for example, there is this planning effort going on right now, not only to identify sites as critical areas from an ecological perspective, but also to really link the land and sea early on in the process, so that they don't fall into the -- a situation that the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park did.

The other thing, I was interested that neither you nor Gail mentioned the zoning efforts that are going on at the national level in New Zealand, which from what I call tell are

clandestine, secretive -- I hope -- I guess this is being recorded, so I'm probably going to get -- (Laughter.)

-- in trouble here. But I was very interested when I was -- started to look at the question of what we could learn from zoning with MPAs to what we could learn, applying that knowledge to kind of whole-scale ocean zoning. That New Zealand was one of the countries that set out -- has publicly stated that they are going to produce an ocean zoning plan for all of their waters.

And there is very little information that I could glean about that process, but the extent to which the existing -- which protected areas in New Zealand, which are essentially opportunistic protected areas in the sense that they weren't science driven. They are not the result of a science-driven process by which all of the traditional knowledge and the conventional know, western or, you more scientific knowledge was assembled to figure out

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

where the critical areas where, which is the process by which the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park was zoned and continues to be rezoned.

That rather, the New Zealanders went through an attempt to identify buyer regions, as you said, and then get whatever marine protected areas they could get in place where there was the least amount of public, you know, conflict over the selection of the site.

CHAIR BROMLEY: And pushback from the fishing industry.

DR. AGARDY: Right. Exactly. So what you have -- and I don't think it's a bad thing necessarily, but what you have is not a kind of attempt to zone parts of New Zealand water according to what kind of protection should be afforded according to, you know, what -- the ecological importance of an area or the traditional values associated with an area, but rather where they could get them.

So they have a system now of MPAs that exists where they could get them, and the question

NEAL R. GROSS

that's going to be really interesting I think in the coming years is: how do they take that -- is that going to be the basis for their zoning plan, which I think most of us when we think about ocean zoning would think about a rationale which would say these are the most critical areas to protect that will give you sustained production over time and conserve your biodiversity.

And so the most strictly protected areas within a zoning plan you would assume would be the marine protected areas or the marine reserves. And that's not the way it is currently, so the foundation from which they are going to be building into the future is one where they have a kind of different -- they've gone down one path, and now they're going down another path, and we'll see how those two paths converge. So

CHAIR BROMLEY: Let me just say this.

I'm sorry if I left the impression that the Great

Barrier Reef was the greatest success story in

history. I am simply trying to tell stories about

NEAL R. GROSS

And I think in -- then we'll go -- in your 1 2 last comment, Tundi, maybe this is part of the tension. 3 As more of a political economist kind 4 of person, I might look at the New Zealand thing 5 and say, "Tell me exactly what's wrong with them 6 7 getting what they can get, rather than getting what the scientific community says is the optimal 8 thing to get." Okay? I'd like you to entertain 9 10 that possibility. Ιf protected 11 can get areas opportunistically, tell me what's wrong with that. 12 13 I mean --DR. AGARDY: Do you want me to tell 14 you? 15 (Laughter.) 16 CHAIR BROMLEY: Well, all right. Not 17 now, but -- but there are two ways to skin a cat, 18 19 and one way when you've got a powerful native community and a powerful white community to -- and 20 then, fishing industry thrown in there. Getting 21 what you can get as a start is a way to get started, 22

so this is not the place for a debate about that. 1 But I think part of the struggle is 2 that the scientific community says, "Ah, these 3 are the best places. They must be protected." 4 And then, they express surprise when the fishing 5 industry and others say, "Excuse me." 6 7 That's a fair kind of reaction from people. "I'm sorry. Tell me again exactly what you see." 8 Bob Bendick and then Gil. 9 Okay. 10 MR. BENDICK: Dan, just briefly, I think your presentation was very helpful, and 11 it illustrates what I believe are three things, 12 13 three issues with the framework report that need to be revisited in the next couple of days. 14 One is representation, two is funding, 15 three is regional context. And I think there 16 are problems with the report in all three of those 17 areas that we should provide enough time to 18 19 discuss. 20 CHAIR BROMLEY: Great. Good. 21 we can.

NEAL R. GROSS

Gil?

1	MR. RADONSKI: Yes. I'd like to thank
2	you for bringing up one point about terminology.
3	I think this whole report is terminologically
4	challenged, and I think that would be it's
5	tough reading it as an insider. I consider myself
6	an MPA insider. As this goes to the outside
7	community, they are just going to go bonkers.
8	(Laughter.)
9	So thank you for raising that point.
10	(Laughter.)
11	CHAIR BROMLEY: They might go bonkers,
12	and they might also be confused about what we're
13	talking about. Right? Is that the same thing?
14	Okay.
15	Ellen?
16	MS. GOETHEL: I just wanted to go back
17	to New Zealand really quickly. My husband last
18	summer last spring was invited by California
19	Seagrant to go
20	CHAIR BROMLEY: Can you bring the
21	microphone a bit closer?
22	MS. GOETHEL: Really quickly, my

husband was invited by Seagrant -- California Seagrant to visit the fisheries in New Zealand, and basically he asked one question several times during his visit. And what it was is when they restructured their fisheries, basically the fisheries were sold off to four or five major corporations.

CHAIR BROMLEY: Right.

MS. GOETHEL: Small fishermen are gone. The small fishermen are bitter. They sold out at a time when they felt that they got very little for their history. So there are fishermen there that are sitting around drinking that do not have a fishing interest anymore. And they — some of them have gone to fishing for the companies, but they are still very, very bitter.

So you have four large industries, fishing industries, that control the fishing interests. Therefore, they have money behind them, so that they have -- can make sure that the areas that they want to fish in are closed.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	That has had a real impact.
2	And the one question he kept asking
3	was: when you went about the restructuring, did
4	you take into consideration the social impact?
5	And the answer was no.
6	CHAIR BROMLEY: Yes. It's worse than
7	you told. When they gave it away, they gave it
8	away to the white commercial fishing industry,
9	And then the Maori said, "Excuse me." And then,
10	the government had to buy it back, and so on.
11	So there's more of a history in New Zealand than
12	MS. GOETHEL: And the minorities are
13	not fishing it themselves. They've sold their
14	interest with other people to do it. So there
15	are some severe problems
16	CHAIR BROMLEY: Yes.
17	MS. GOETHEL: in New Zealand.
18	CHAIR BROMLEY: Jim Ray, and then Mike
19	Cruickshank.
20	DR. RAY: I just wanted to bring out
21	a small point at this point. You know, your
22	comment about, "Well, go ahead and make marine

protected areas, and the money will come later."

CHAIR BROMLEY: Yes.

DR. RAY: Historically, that really has been what we've seen here in the U.S. in general. And, you know, one of the things we've talked about with marine protected areas and the systems of marine protected areas, one of the most important things is the general buying of all stakeholders.

And if you start having marine protected areas -- large marine protected areas that are not properly funded, and cannot carry out their mission and their mandate, including the area where you need protection and where you have to have enforcement, and if there's not money to do that, these things are going to fail and you're going to have an awful lot of takeover groups that are going to be very unhappy.

And we really need -- you know, if we're going to have marine protected areas, we need to try to be sure they have adequate funding, so they can succeed. And so I'm just -- again,

NEAL R. GROSS

I'm just really cautious about, you know, us proceeding on some of these things, you know, without the adequate funding so we can do these things the right way.

That's really the only comment I wanted to make.

CHAIR BROMLEY: I understand that, Thank you. But I think also it's part of Jim. our linguistic morass that we find ourselves in, because you keep saying, well, a marine protected area -- that means something quite specific to many people, whereas a park or a sanctuary or something else may not mean something quite as specific. So my point simply was in Australia they created a thing called a park. People expected great protection in that park, and it wasn't there, and then they began to demand protection. And then, people said, "All right. If you want protection, it's going to take That's all I meant by that story, and money." I think maybe there is a lesson there for us, but I don't want to push it too far.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

DR. RAY: Well, even, you know, the discussions we've had today about the possibility of having a series of reserves -- small, big, research, or otherwise. And I understand, you know, the reason for the suggestions. But let's say it's going to take 25 years if you have a series of reserves off the coast of Oregon.

reserves, and if you don't have adequate -- adequate funds out there to conduct the monitoring research to really evaluate the effectiveness of those areas that you're claiming have been made reserves, then you're really not going to know whether you've really succeeded in what you were trying to accomplish in the first place.

And so it's very important that that program over that 25 years have adequate funds available so that they can do the research monitoring that is necessary to gain the benefit and learn something from those areas having been made reserves. That's another example of where

NEAL R. GROSS

L	the two go hand in hand.
2	CHAIR BROMLEY: But
3	purpose. I mean, if the purpo

6

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

it depends on the se of the reserve is to restore decimated stocks, then, yes, you need a serious monitoring program to see whether stocks have come back.

If the purpose of the reserve is to reserve a piece of habitat, then by virtue of the declaration of it as a reserve, you've done what you wanted to do. Okay?

> MS. GOETHEL: No. No.

CHAIR BROMLEY: No?

MS. GOETHEL: No. You have to have monitoring if you have -- if you have a habitat that you want to preserve, and you don't have monitoring, things can go on that destroy that habitat naturally, and you don't know about it. Then, we found that in New England there are areas that have been protected for specific reasons where invasive species have come in and seem to have destroyed that environment.

And that's something that needed to

1	be monitored at the time that could have been
2	corrected that were so, Dan, I strongly
3	disagree. You really need monitoring if you're
4	going to have an enclosed area of protection.
5	CHAIR BROMLEY: Okay. These
6	wonderful pinnacles that they showed us in the
7	slides, I wish I could remember where it was.
8	Where is that, Mark, all these great things
9	sticking out in the ocean, okay? Do you know
10	where that was on the coast? It doesn't really
11	matter.
12	You know, these rock formations out
12 13	You know, these rock formations out here along the coast? If we discovered that rock
13	here along the coast? If we discovered that rock
13 14	here along the coast? If we discovered that rock climbers were up there devastating those things
13 14 15	here along the coast? If we discovered that rock climbers were up there devastating those things and chipping rocks off and doing all sorts of
13 14 15 16	here along the coast? If we discovered that rock climbers were up there devastating those things and chipping rocks off and doing all sorts of horrible things to them, and the idea was to set
13 14 15 16	here along the coast? If we discovered that rock climbers were up there devastating those things and chipping rocks off and doing all sorts of horrible things to them, and the idea was to set it aside as a reserve, and you do it and you stop
13 14 15 16 17	here along the coast? If we discovered that rock climbers were up there devastating those things and chipping rocks off and doing all sorts of horrible things to them, and the idea was to set it aside as a reserve, and you do it and you stop that, isn't that what you wanted to accomplish?
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	here along the coast? If we discovered that rock climbers were up there devastating those things and chipping rocks off and doing all sorts of horrible things to them, and the idea was to set it aside as a reserve, and you do it and you stop that, isn't that what you wanted to accomplish? I mean, sorry, I don't want to keep

1 Dan."

(Laughter.)

CHAIR BROMLEY: So, Mike, I have you, and then maybe I should shut up. I've abused my chairmanship privilege I think. If you want me to be quiet, I will.

Mike?

DR. CRUICKSHANK: (Inaudible comment from an unmiked location.)

DR. OGDEN: (Inaudible comment from an unmiked location.)

CHAIR BROMLEY: Mark?

DR. HIXON: Just a brief note about perspective. In this discussion of the Great Barrier Reef Park, whether it has been successful or not from whatever perspective you're seeing, it's important I think to keep in mind the scale of this park. The Great Barrier Reef Marine Park is on the same scale as the west coast of the United States from Seattle to San Diego. So it's not calling it a park. It's kind of a misnomer. It's a huge, huge area.

CHAIR BROMLEY: Thank you for your -- oh, George. Yes. Are you going to compliment me or criticize me?

(Laughter.)

MR. LAPOINTE: I'm going to compliment you. Put that on the record, Mr. Chairman.

(Laughter.)

I think as we think about developing the system, I think there's got to be -- you know, there is clearly an element of planning. We're going through that, but we can plan to death. You know? And there's an element of taking advantage of opportunity that needs to be there as well.

And showing both my age and my history, there's an old Steve Goodman song called "Searching for the Perfect High." And that's a tendency we have to do sometimes. We want to plan everything perfectly, and we'll all die of old age and we won't get support for the system, because it will be a planning exercise. So there

needs to come a point where we continue planning, but we start slipping in elements of the system and get them going.

I've said in Maine that if people think about the big system -- I said it yesterday.

I said they think about MPA is like getting a disease right now, because they don't know what it means to them, to use Bob Zales' term.

And I've contended that what they need to do is look at the bioregion, look at what areas we need to tab as representative, but then pick one, pick one and get started because that's how you're going to have the discussions about how much funding you need, how much enforcement you need, how much monitoring you need.

And so I think we've got to keep that discussion alive and that tension alive because I think it's useful for the discussion about the systems -- the system we're trying to work on. But the components of the system and the support for the system as well.

CHAIR BROMLEY: Well, that's right.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	I mean, don't let the best be the enemy or the
2	better. I mean okay, I'll stop here.
3	What should we do? It's quarter 'til
4	12:00. Should we break for lunch and
5	PARTICIPANT: I don't think they're
6	quite ready.
7	CHAIR BROMLEY: Well, we could break
8	for other things and then have lunch.
9	PARTICIPANT: Can we let Ricky make
10	a quick announcement?
11	(Whereupon, the proceedings in the foregoing
12	matter went off the record for a lunch
13	break.)
14	CHAIR BROMLEY: We lost before
15	lunch we lost the chance for subcommittee reports.
16	So we'll do that now. And they can be as short
17	or as long as each of the subcommittees wishes,
18	and then once that's finished we will go into
19	subcommittee meetings.
20	So, you know, if you have something
21	to tell us now, that's good. And if you want
22	to eat, you can just pass and then you will have

1 the rest of the afternoon. We will adjourn at 5:00. this will be on the honor system. We won't 2 have you come back here and slam the gavel down 3 and adjourn. You just meet until whenever, 5:00, 4 6:00 if you're really hard working, whatever. 5 We should meet in the lobby at 6:45 6 7 for transport to the restaurant -- the lobby of the hotel, not the lobby here. 8 PARTICIPANT: At what time, Dan? 9 CHAIR BROMLEY: At 6:45. We're booked 10 at 7:00 at Quincy's, and I assume it takes 10 11 or 15 minutes to get there, 5 minutes. Who knows 12 13 where Quincy's is? Mark? Five, 10 minutes north, is it? 14 DR. HIXON: 15 Yes. CHAIR BROMLEY: Okay. So be in the 16 lobby of the hotel at 6:45. We'll mobilize 17 transportation and the dinner will start at 7:00. 18 19 And so let's just go through the subcommittees, see if you want to say anything to us now. 20 can be about what you've done, what you think 21

you're going to do this afternoon or tomorrow.

1	So, Subcommittee 1, Max?
2	MR. PETERSON: I'm not ready yet.
3	CHAIR BROMLEY: Okay. I'll go to
4	somebody else.
5	MR. PETERSON: Since they're up, do
6	you want to let them go?
7	CHAIR BROMLEY: We'll start here,
8	then.
9	DR. MURRAY: This is Steve Murray from
LO	Subcommittee 3. Remember, we left you last time
L1	with the charge for us to make a few small edits
L2	and revisions to this document that we are seeking
L3	your approval on. And so we have done that, and
L4	I would like to run you through those real
L5	quickly.
L6	The changes are all indicated in red,
L7	with the change comments on the right-hand margin.
L8	So in we had about five changes that we were
L9	asked to address. You can see those indicated
20	right here, which is the red italicized statement.
21	This is in response to Tony's request that for

comment, that we should try to get up in the very

front of the document something more meaningful rather than wait until the end, and we've done

that with this statement.

So I'm going to walk you through these, and then we'll come back and ask one at a time if anybody has any issues over them. The second issue that we were asked to address was to make sure that we qualified the U.S. EEZ to include state and territorial waters, which we've done here. And the third issue had to do with Max's suggestion that we have this unwieldy parenthetical definition of MMAs.

And as we were playing with this for a while, we all are of the opinion that we just want to remove this bullet rather than to try to deflect things in another direction, because if you look at this we're basically saying that the President's response states that the administration will continue to work towards an ecosystem-based approach.

The plan includes a variety of explicitly place-based protection measures, such

as -- and we listed a few of them, and I think for simplicity's sake we're just better eliminating that. Okay?

I think we had -- Dennis in particular had a comment about the definition of EBM being a compass definition, so we have altered this to indicate that there are multiple definitions.

And for purposes of this document we're going to define it as follows: using the compass format.

The next change, Tundi had suggested that we might want to give some other examples besides management of marine fisheries, and so we have put in here the biosphere reserves and the Chesapeake Bay program as examples of situations where MPAs are being used as tools in EBM.

And then, the conclusion statement is retained with the deletion of the first sentence. We just went up to the top of the document.

So we come back up here, and by

NEAL R. GROSS

1	putting this first statement up into the top of
2	the document, the very first thing you see in
3	the document, we thought that we ought to change
4	the title rather than have ecosystem approaches
5	to management and then ecosystem-based
6	management to just call it ecosystem-based
7	management from the beginning.
8	So what I'd like to do is to just say,
9	first of all, does anybody have objections or
10	comments you'd like to make about the title
11	change?
12	CHAIR BROMLEY: No.
13	DR. MURRAY: All right. Any
14	suggestions or comments about the first sentence
15	here that follows the title? Go ahead.
16	DR. HALSEY: Yes. In that last
17	paragraph from which I believe you took this,
18	you say that MPAs have been, are, and will
19	continue to be an essential tool for each for
20	an ecosystem-based approach to management. And
21	there you've just got that we'll evolve.

And so you went from "essential" to

"evolve." That sounds like a pretty big change to me.

DR. MURRAY: We have talked about and went back and forth a little bit I think about whether we should move the sentence you're referring to up to the front as well. And if you read it, come down here, we're talking about this bottom passage right here. Dennis is addressing this particular -- this particular sentence that's now on lines 112 and 113.

So we could elevate the entire passage up to the front of the document. By doing it -- by laying it out as we did, we simply wanted to put the single emphasis that both EBM and MPAs are place-based, and that's essentially the difference. whether this conclusive statement gets shoved up in front, or whether it stays here at the end.

I think if we move this statement, these two sentences, if we move them up to the front of the document, then I'm not sure we really have any -- we don't have a conclusion, then.

NEAL R. GROSS

The paragraph above it would simply be a continuation of the one before that. So, I mean, I think the options are to move all of this up to the front, and then eliminate the conclusion component of the document or to leave it as it is. Mark?

DR. HIXON: Well, I think addressing your comment, Dennis, if you say something involves something, I mean, to me that's essence. So how would you just change that first sentence to be happy as opposed to yanking the whole concluding paragraph up front?

DR. HEINEMANN: Well, let's say that I'm happy with the conclusion you've got. I was thinking back to I think it was Tony's comment that led to that -- to the movement or the creation of that sentence up front, which I thought he was suggesting that you give the conclusions right up front. And so that's what I think was what I was expecting, was to see something from that final paragraph.

There was even talk, I believe, when

NEAL R. GROSS

1	we were discussing when you responded
2	to about moving that paragraph up there. So
3	I guess that's what I was expecting, and thinking
4	that it had you had done that, but then changed
5	the sense of the conclusion. But it's not the
6	same conclusion that
7	DR. HIXON: We actually moved that
8	whole paragraph up front. And when we did that,
9	we realized that it just seemed extremely awkward
10	sitting there out of context, especially the very
11	last sentence of the concluding paragraph.
12	CHAIR BROMLEY: Steve, can I get in?
13	I mean, the word "involve" may be MPAs and
14	EBMs are both place-based approaches for the
15	protection of marine resources. Does that help
16	you?
17	DR. HIXON: Or you can say necessarily
18	and necessarily involved.
19	DR. CHATWIN: May I?
20	CHAIR BROMLEY: Wait. Let's hear from
21	Tony.
22	DR. CHATWIN: Yes. I don't think that

they're both approaches. I think one is an approach, and one is a tool. And the concluding sentence captures that very well.

I had suggested to put that up front, because I think that's the message we're trying to communicate. And that was the question I raised earlier, that we were trying to communicate. We've actually captured really well trying to communicate.

However, looking at today, I still think that would be the best -- that message would be best up front. I recognize that in the title it already says an essential tool for ecosystem, and that's the message, so that's the title.

I also like that there was a clarifying statement that we wrote. What I don't like is that we -- the marine ecosystem management and marine protected areas are major topics of discussion and debate. That just means, you know, this is out there. This is -- and then, so it starts really broad, and then we narrow it down and end up with a conclusion, and that is the

NEAL R. GROSS

science paper.

It gives the context for the issue. You sort of narrow it down and give it the relevance, and then this is my hypothesis, and here is my conclusion. That's not how we have to structure this.

And we're almost there. I don't -- I don't have a specific schedule, but I guess that sentence saying that it's this huge broad thing is what -- those are issues for discussion, and it's all sort of nebulous.

I think we could start much more focused and refined, which is the idea, that we would reach that, because system-based management -- system-based management is something that administration had adopted as an approach, and that -- so that's a real world concept, and that MPAs are an essential tool for that.

And that, to me, has to be the opening message, and then we can go into the rest of it.

DR. MURRAY: Let's do this. Let's

go through the rest of the changes and see if
we're back only to this one issue. Okay?
MR. PETERSON: Can I suggest a change
to this, the first one? Both place-based and
incorporate special protection of marine
resources or utilize them, or something like
hat.
DR. MURRAY: Okay.
MR. PETERSON: But I would be for
letting the subcommittee do the editing on this.
I think the committee as a whole cannot
DR. MURRAY: That's why I want to see
if we have any other issues, because if we have
any if we have no other issues, then we can
spend a little more time on this particular one.
MR. PETERSON: I have one other word
change that I'd like to present.
DR. MURRAY: A word change. Go ahead.
MR. PETERSON: Go down go all the
way down.
DR. MURRAY: Let's pick them up as
we get there.

		MR	- •	PETERSON:	All	right
--	--	----	-----	-----------	-----	-------

DR. MURRAY: So does anybody have any problem with the parenthetical -- the little clause here including state and territorial waters? Everybody happy with that, I presume?

PARTICIPANT: I'm happy.

DR. MURRAY: All right. Anybody object to striking out this particular bulleted item? Thank you. You catch me when I get to your spot. Is everybody happy with the way that we've handled this now?

Dennis?

DR. HEINEMANN: I have a question about that. I'm largely happy with that. One of the other comments we got was concern about the goal part of that statement. And I recall she said something, it's not all about people. That second sentence there, "The goal of ecosystem-based management is to maintain," blah, blah, blah, blah, "so that it can provide the services humans want and need."

And I guess the question I wanted to

ask you guys is: I think I made the point yesterday that various definitions of EBM vary in a lot of different ways. One way in which they vary is in terms of the goal that ecosystem-based management might have. And this is -- I think I agree with her interpretation of this. This is a rather definitive statement of what the goal is -- is that it's to provide human services and needs, and the way you do that is by the first part of the sentence, maintain ecosystems, but the goal, the purpose, is human services and needs.

And is that the goal that we want to be driving toward with ecosystem-based management and marine protected areas as they fit into ecosystem-based management? Because it's just one on a spectrum of possible goals that we could have, some more human-oriented and some less human-oriented.

DR. MURRAY: One point that we need to consider is that that entire passage from line 53 to line 65 is a direct quote from the compass

NEAL R. GROSS

1	consensus statement. So anything we do there
2	we're literally dealing with lines 53 to 65.
3	Mark?
4	DR. HIXON: I would just go to when
5	I read that sentence, Dennis, I read, "The goal
6	of ecosystem-based management is to maintain an
7	ecosystem in a healthy, productive, and resilient
8	condition." That's what I read. And then,
9	there's a clause added on to it about human
10	utility and what not. So I can't disagree with
11	that first clause.
12	I think that first clause is exactly
13	what you're talking about. Am I right?
14	DR. HEINEMANN: No, I'm talking about
15	the clause that's added on the end.
16	DR. HIXON: Right. But I see the first
17	clause
18	DR. HEINEMANN: The purpose of
19	the that's the purpose for the goal.
20	DR. HIXON: Yes, I guess we're just
21	reading the sentence differently.
22	CHAIR BROMLEY: We're getting close

1	to getting back to a subcommittee to work on it
2	some more.
3	DR. HEINEMANN: No, this isn't about
4	wording, because I think Steven is right. We
5	can't change the wording of this. This is pulled
6	from another document. This has to do more about
7	a philosophical question of, does this committee
8	want to be perhaps perceived as endorsing one
9	particular of many goals for ecosystem-based
10	management? That's the question I'm asking.
11	I can't say I'm personally too worried about it.
12	DR. MURRAY: Is there anybody else
13	who wants to raise a concern?
14	CHAIR BROMLEY: I'd like to raise a
15	concern, and I'd also like to recognize Fran here
16	in a second.
17	MS. WENZEL: Are you still on this
18	issue? I think Dan is onto a new one.
19	CHAIR BROMLEY: I want to go to
20	DR. MURRAY: Whatever. You're the
21	boss.
22	CHAIR BROMLEY: No. I want to go back

Marine protected areas. Essential tools for ecosystem-based management. Reading this, "essential" then transfers into "necessary," maps into necessary, which means to me that one cannot do ecosystem-based management without an MPA. That's what the word "essential" means. Okay? It is an essential tool for ecosystem-based management.

I challenge that. And, Fran, I just received word that Jim is not feeling well, and Jim -- my understanding is Jim is not entirely comfortable with some of this. And, Fran, would you -- could I recognize you to try to convey what it was that Jim would like to convey to us?

MS. WILSHUSEN: Yes, as best I can. He just -- he apologizes for not being able to be here this afternoon, but asked that if this came back up, and he thought that it would, that folks would have an opportunity to hear that he is uncomfortable with the document in a number of areas, the largest being what you --

NEAL R. GROSS

1	CHAIR BROMLEY: What I just said?
2	MS. WILSHUSEN: Mr. Chairman just
3	brought up that "essential" indicates I mean,
4	ecosystem-based management is something that the
5	tribes work with and support and engage in in
6	a very comprehensive kind of way. The other issue
7	that he had was there was a piece of the cultural
8	resources section down below that he would like
9	to see expanded. That was a smaller issue.
10	CHAIR BROMLEY: So, yes, we can tinker
11	with words, Steve, but I think to me there is
12	a fundamental issue. This implies necessity,
13	that you cannot have ecosystem-based management
14	without an MPA.
15	DR. MURRAY: So let's let me get
16	through the last few of these minor changes, so
17	we know what we have to concentrate on.
18	CHAIR BROMLEY: Okay.
19	DR. MURRAY: All right. So we're down
20	to line 99 and 100. Everybody happy with that?
21	Hearing no problems yes? I'm sorry.
22	MR. BOWMAN: Just as a matter of

1	correctness, could you back up to the thing about
2	multiple agencies?
3	Mary, is Seymour in any of the ocean
4	action plans?
5	DR. MURRAY: What line number are you
6	talking about?
7	MR. BOWMAN: I'm sorry, where Park
8	Service and NOAA and all of that are engaging
9	in ecosystem-based management. Yes, right there.
10	Is anybody under Seymour trying to develop an
11	administration-wide definition of
12	ecosystem-based management?
13	MS. GLACKIN: Well, we haven't taken
14	on specifically the definition, but we are
15	working on regional workshops to basically move
16	this concept forward, and I think they, you know,
17	at that detailed level will be you know, will
18	be engaging in that.
19	MR. BOWMAN: Okay. Because I don't
20	see how to capture that here. I was just concerned
21	that that gives the impression oh, wait a
22	minute. That's not the right paragraph.

1	PARTICIPANT: Help those of us out
2	who aren't in the loop.
3	MS. GLACKIN: It's the Subcommittee
4	for Integrated Management of Ocean Resources that
5	got set up under the Ocean Action Plan.
6	MR. BOWMAN: I'm sorry. There was
7	a paragraph back up I think just about two
8	or three sentences, whether they had multiple
9	agencies engaging in MPAs. Keep going up. Keep
10	going up. Just a minute.
11	No, I'm sorry. Unless you've dropped
12	it out, I could have sworn that I
13	MS. GLACKIN: It's under Conclusion.
14	MR. BOWMAN: Under Conclusion. All
15	right. My impression on reading that is that
16	you've got eight different agencies going every
17	which way.
18	DR. MURRAY: You're talking about
19	MR. BOWMAN: You have the challenge
20	being addressed by the Advisory Committee, the
21	MPA Center, NOAA Fisheries. And I was just
22	thinking if there was just as a clarification,

1	if there was a set process, but that sort of thing
2	is too diffuse and so I just say let's just I
3	don't have any way to approve that. I just thought
4	if there was a single effort underway we could
5	MS. GLACKIN: Well, there certainly
6	is an action that could be cited in the Seymour
7	work plan that's out there in public. I could
8	look at that line which
9	DR. MURRAY: All right. So if one
10	of you wants to provide some input to that, we'll
11	accept it. We need to work on the title and what
12	goes up front. And that's the end of our report.
13	CHAIR BROMLEY: Good. Thank you.
14	Sorry to hammer on you so much.
15	Yes, George?
16	MR. LAPOINTE: Well, I want to hammer
17	on you a little bit. Go back Steve, could
18	you go to your title slide? The title at the
19	top of the document, I apologize.
20	So you're saying it's not
21	essential marine protected area is, you know,
22	a pretty good tool for ecosystem-based management.

Help me out here a little bit.

CHAIR BROMLEY: I don't have revised language. All I'm saying is if one reads what the word "essential" means, to me that maps into "necessary." It means you cannot get one thing without the other. That's what essentiality means to me. Okay?

So all I'm questioning, then, is -- is with the claiming. This is a claim that marine protected areas are essential for ecosystem-based management, meaning that MPAs are necessary in order to have -- that's what that speaks.

MR. LAPOINTE: And I think that's what people are trying to say.

CHAIR BROMLEY: That might be what they're trying to say. I would like to object, you know, personally to that assertion, and I think Jim Woods also would challenge it, because I think Native Americans believe they do ecosystem-based management and can do it without an MPA. Okay?

So, therefore, if they can do it, then MPA is not essential for ecosystem-based management. So that's I think the issue here -- what the committee wishes -- what message we wish to convey.

You may wish I stayed on as Chairman when you see how I can fight.

(Laughter.)

PARTICIPANT: Let me follow up on that.

If we're using the definition of MPA that is as big as the bridge that crosses the river over here, I would argue that many of the things that both Jim and the other gentleman said they do fits into the definition of a permanent protection in place-based.

So I -- and I think that in hearing their message they would say that was critical as well. So I'm not -- I think that's worthy of some further argument before we either pitch it or keep it in, because I -- you know, again, it's a strong message one way or the other.

CHAIR BROMLEY: Okay. I've got Bob

NEAL R. GROSS

Zales and Mark and Mike and --

MR. ZALES: I was going to bring this up, too, under the conclusions where it mentions essential, and then I started looking at this and saw it on top, so I thought the two went together. But I've got the same concern as you, because to me "essential" means that you can't do any of this unless you've got an MPA.

And I'm not sure you have to have an MPA in order to have ecosystem-based management. So, and this gets into what somebody commented earlier, and I know we've talked about it throughout the history of this -- of this committee, is the audience that reads these things, is what was commented today that's been published in the Federal Register, that this is language in here that the average citizen -- first off, the average citizen doesn't even read the Federal Register.

But when he gets a copy of what's out there, what they read, a lot of what's in there they don't understand the terminology. So when

a member of the public reads "essential," if they've got any kind of education at all, they're going to say, "Well, that means they have to have this." And for people that have problems with MPAs and the definitions on what they may or may not be, a lot of them are going to say, "I don't think so, so I'm not going to support it."

CHAIR BROMLEY: Mark?

DR. HIXON: I see a huge issue of semantics here. It's very clear that the tribes have always had an ecosystem-based perspective on what they do, and a very holistic perspective on how resources are managed. There's no question about that.

There is also this new phenomenon that has been getting a lot of play in policy discussions called ecosystem-based management.

And every single paper I've read about this particular concept, those three words, there is -- MPAs are part -- are one of the tools involved in that particular approach to management of marine resources.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	CHAIR BROMLEY: Did you say "one of
2	the tools"?
3	DR. HIXON: Is one of the tools
4	CHAIR BROMLEY: Well, that's my
5	argument. One of the essential tools, that means
6	there's more than one tool, so, therefore, it
7	can't be essential.
8	DR. HIXON: Well, I disagree with
9	that.
LO	CHAIR BROMLEY: Okay.
11	DR. HIXON: I'm saying one of the
12	essential tools for ecosystem-based management.
13	So the fact that somebody has an ecosystem
L4	perspective in their approach, no disagreement
15	there. There's a whole variety of things in terms
L6	of ecosystem perspective and holistic
L7	perspective that may not necessarily involve
L8	MPAs.
L9	But every document I've read about
20	ecosystem-based management in the oceans does
21	involve MPAs. That's my experience.

Thanks.

1	CHAIR BROMLEY: Mike?
2	DR. CRUICKSHANK: (Inaudible comment
3	from an unmiked location.)
4	CHAIR BROMLEY: I'd like to ask Steve
5	to take it back and
6	DR. MURRAY: We'll take it back, but
7	one more thing I would point out is that if you
8	go to the thesaurus, you have for "essential"
9	you have necessary, you have fundamental. And
LO	"essential" you're defining very narrowly, but
11	not inaccurately, but there are other definitions
L2	of and other ways to translate the word
L3	"essential."
L4	We'll take it back to committee and
L5	work on it and come up with another word that
L6	we think conveys in another way the meaning that
L7	we all want to have. So we have two things we're
18	going to do. We're going to work on that title,
L9	and we're going to work on what goes in right
20	below the title, and then we're going to bring
21	it back.

And when we bring it back, we're

1	assuming that we're not going to hear anything
2	more about the rest of the document at this point
3	in time.
4	(Laughter.)
5	We'll talk about it and get it taken
6	care of. Okay?
7	CHAIR BROMLEY: Good. Subcommittee
8	3 or 2? Who 2 or 1? Who wants to 1, are
9	you ready?
10	MR. PETERSON: Okay. We're not going
11	to have you edit this paper yet. It's not ready
12	for prime time.
13	PARTICIPANT: Ah, gee, Max.
14	MR. PETERSON: Bob Zales is going to
15	kick off this part of the presentation with the
16	help of Jonathan on the computer keyboards. Okay.
17	Bob?
18	MR. ZALES: Okay. This is our report.
19	I haven't seen this thing yet, so you can flip
20	over to the next page. That's the members of
21	our committee that everybody can read. And I
22	can't read that.

The key questions we were tasked to -- key question we were tasked with was: how should planning for the national system MPAs be done in a way that encourages cooperation and coordination among the different approaches to marine management at the regional, national, and international levels?

The subquestion is: what are some examples of where governments and stakeholders organized to work together at the regional and/or ecosystem level to enhance resource management and/or conservation? And I believe we've really got 10 or 11 examples of those, and a couple of them we were going to let be talked about here.

The approach was to identify and examine the nature of experiences and lessons learned from existing regional efforts and case studies, which is a questionnaire that we developed and interviewed people. And then, we were going to draw on these experiences to develop best practices that can help with the implementation of the national system at the

NEAL R. GROSS

regional level.

The selective case studies were a south Florida ecosystem -- was myself and Bob Bendick, which Bob handled this because I got busy and wasn't able to get involved in it. I've got a couple of studies from the Gulf Council and one from Dr. Russell Nelson, who used to be the Executive Director for Florida Marine Fisheries Commission.

System was Charlie. North Pacific Fishery
Management Council effort to establish cold water
corals habitat protection in the Gulf of Alaska
was Dave Bennett. The Gulf of Maine Council was
the MPA Center, the Great Barrier Reef was the
MPA Center, Appalachian Trail Conference was Max.
Wild and scenic rivers were Max, Gulf of Mexico
Alliance was also Bob Bendick, world heritage
transboundary sites was Eric Gilman, and tribes
in Washington marine co-management was Jim Woods.

So I guess, Bob, do you want to go over part of your south Florida management?

MR. BENDICK: Briefly. I'm going to talk about the sort of two related south Florida efforts, one south Florida ecosystem restoration task force and working group, and also the various aspects of the Florida Keys national marine sanctuary, which some could consider a network of reserves, including the Water Quality Steering Committee and Sanctuary Advisory Committee.

Of course, there are other people here who know more about this than I do, and Dan Suman is particularly an expert on these subjects. But these two efforts clearly produce results. Whether you think that the plan for Everglades restoration is a great plan or a flawed plan, it's going forward, and the groups got together and agreed that it should go forward, a very wide range of federal and state agencies.

And similarly, the Florida Keys
National Marine Sanctuary exists, has expanded,
has been managed, has had a measure of success.
So these are examples that have produced real

NEAL R. GROSS

results in finite time.

So just to talk a little bit about the sort of ingredients of success -- and when I say "success" I'm not saying the ultimate ecological success of the -- of either Everglades restoration or the Keys sanctuary, but the success of these efforts to draw in and engage a wide variety of agencies and stakeholders.

Some of the ingredients that I think are common to both the south Florida effort and the Keys effort is really a subset of that, is that pretty much everybody affected by these actions was somehow involved -- federal agencies, state agencies, local agencies, tribes, and stakeholders. And they all were motivated to be involved. There was clear motivation for engagement.

In the case of the Everglades, somebody was going to spend \$8 billion there. It was going to affect a lot of people and interests, and people were clamoring to be at the table. In the case of the Keys, the Congress

passed the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary designation. There was going to be a sanctuary and, again, people wanted to participate because something was going to happen and they wanted

to be at the table.

But other ingredients of success were clearly there was money, resources, to fuel that engagement, to have meetings to provide studies, information, to keep it going. There were individuals responsible for coordination and collaboration of agencies, for ensuring that people were at the table.

In the case of the Keys, it was the sanctuary manager, Billy Kozzi. In the case of the Everglades, there was a federal Interior officer who coordinated the south Florida ecosystem management task force. So there was somebody to go to to ensure that cooperation was taking place.

Thirdly, ingredients for success, there was leadership. Not only were these people designated to do the job, but, like in the case

NEAL R. GROSS

of Billy, they were impassioned at doing the job of bringing stakeholders and people into -- you know, potentially that should and would cooperate to the table.

Next, there was some flexibility in these arrangements, so they could adapt and change with time. They were not rigid, and they existed for a long period of time, and they could respond to their mistakes, controversies, screwups, and change.

And, finally, there were clear routes for stakeholder input, that while some people were more unhappy than others in different times in both the creation of the Everglades plan and the creation of the plan and implementation of the sanctuary, really every stakeholder had a route to be heard and to participate and their participation was recorded.

So I think the combination of all those things made these -- are good lessons for how you -- how you draw in different government agencies and stakeholder groups to create

NEAL R. GROSS

specific ecosystem-based products or projects over the long run.

MR. ZALES: Thanks, Bob.

The next quick plan, that was -- Charles was going to do that, right, on this one?

MR. BEEKER: Yes. Well, I was charged with contacting Great Lakes Preserve Systems and I think it might be worthwhile just to do -- briefly give you a little background on that.

Other than the case of Michigan, the setup of preserves started in 1980. The preserves within the Great Lakes started after the Abandoned Shipwreck Act of 1987, and I happen to have been on the archaeological working committee for that, and I think very early it was identified what the law that came out in 1987 and its subsequent guidelines in 1990 entitled the states the ownership and made recommendations for parks and preserves and how this might be done in inventories.

NEAL R. GROSS

The real problem with it was lack of funding. And initially, I remember when this came about, I got off the committee and John and I got together, all the members in the Great Lakes, saw there was a lot of excitement, there was some task force meetings initiated in Michigan, and I -- with that in mind, I thought this questionnaire would be a predictable set of answers we sent out, that I would see this.

What came back I thought was rather interesting. What we're finding is Michigan has an excellent set of preserve systems. They responded. Wisconsin has an excellent preserve system, has responded. Minnesota did not respond. The third response we received was from the Thunder Bay National Marine Sanctuary.

The dichotomy of the response to the questionnaire I thought was interesting, in that talking about the question of how would a series of MPAs be beneficial, or would it be beneficial, we've got Thunder Bay saying absolutely, strongly agree for all the reasons of coordination of the

NEAL R. GROSS

education, potential leverage of funding, but the states came back with there's no funds, and there was never any funds for the Abandoned Shipwreck Act. What funds were available seem to have dried up.

The states themselves find now the responses were that they find instead of managing the shipwrecks and the public outreach and education they are writing grants themselves trying to find funding to maintain the resources they're currently charged by the federal law to protect.

So I guess I would look at my analysis of the three responses is that without some type of coordinating agency or, you know, someone taking the lead -- in this case perhaps the MPA Center, the Great Lakes Region -- that there may not be any tangible benefits they are going to be able to sign on. And what the response was by the state managers, "If it's more paperwork, if it's a website, if it means we need to just participate without any benefit," it doesn't have

NEAL R. GROSS

to be money, but some type of benefit of coordination, then they won't share whether or not it was worth their effort to be involved in it.

So I take from that that it doesn't have to be funding, but that's part of it. And they're all saying they don't have any money.

At the same time, I think this can also be -- other areas could be identified by other subcommittees, benefits, things like communication, coordinating an agency, some way to bring us together. Because if we don't come to the table -- I'm in the State of Indiana. I've tried for 20 years to get our state to be involved. They still don't -- they're not involved. Ohio is not involved. Illinois is not involved in parks and preserves.

They're just not -- they're not at the table, because there's no table to go to.

And I see the MPAs as a powerful way to get a table, but we have to show benefits, and that's what the questionnaire showed.

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. PETERSON: Thank you very much. We picked these two examples to show you different outcomes, and we have a total of 11 examples, including the one that Jim Woods gave us today that we will incorporate.

I'm going to hand you out a full outline of the paper, and we'll have an appendix later that will have all 11 of these case studies that will show you the -- our conclusions. But if you move ahead there now, give me -- we came up with six different -- okay.

Let me just tell you quickly the six things that we came up with that are apparently essential to success, and you don't have to write this down, because it's going to be on the paper.

It's coming around to you.

There must be a clear, common interest of the people that are involved in a region, and there must be some recognized problem or opportunity -- a major problem or an opportunity to be addressed. And it has to be a fairly transparent process that allows

NEAL R. GROSS

different people to come to the table at different times.

And there has to be a group or a person who takes the initiative and provides leadership and some level of staffing or some -- something that will keep it going. If you have a whole big group of people, and there's no process for keeping it going, it's likely to fail.

Finally, there must be some level of persistence. If you look at all of these, none of them happen overnight. Hopefully, most of them won't be as long as the Oregon process, but at least they have some likelihood of achieving results.

And then, there has to be some mechanism in place for communications, either by mail or by conference calls or something, to keep everybody up to date, because everybody can't attend all the meetings.

And then, finally, at least initially, the people need to work within existing authorities. If you want to stop things in their

NEAL R. GROSS

1	tracks, just talk about shifting authorities
2	around. That will take you five years. So we
3	should be working within existing authority.
4	This is a draft. The committee would
5	love to have any comments. We're not asking for
6	you to approve this at this meeting. We're simply
7	giving it to you for your perusal, but we would
8	love to have comments from you.
9	Thank you very much.
10	CHAIR BROMLEY: Thanks very much.
11	Are there any questions or comments for the group?
12	Thank you. That was very nice.
13	Subcommittee 2, Tony, are you
14	DR. CHATWIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
15	You know, yesterday we had the opportunity to
16	give an update of where we stood, and we hadn't
17	had an opportunity to meet as a committee. What
18	I would like to ask my fellow committee members
19	if is anyone has thought about the questions I
20	raised yesterday, overnight, or has some
21	additional information to provide to us.

And I will refresh your memory that

we were talking about an all-inclusive system, whether the system should be tiered or not, and variations of the tiers.

I can say that the people we talked to yesterday, it has helped us think of how we're going to approach these issues this afternoon, and we're going to -- I'm going to recommend to the subcommittee that we set aside the issue of whether it should be tiered or not, or inclusive or not, and focus more on the question that was raised as, what is in it for me. And given that -- the various categories of "me," and we'll start our discussion that way, and hopefully that will inform the debate that we had about tiered or not tiered.

I'd also just like to share thoughts that I had. There is -- regarding this concern about an all-inclusive system that will have 1,500 sites and that -- that is too many perhaps, I think it's important to remember that in that framework there is a very significant step after the framework becomes final. And that is that

NEAL R. GROSS

1	the the relevant authorities have to nominate
2	those sites, and there may be very strong reasons
3	for these authorities not to nominate all of those
4	sites. So the 1,500 is a maximum scenario. Okay?
5	CHAIR BROMLEY: All right. Bob Zales,
6	and Jim Ray.
7	MR. ZALES: Yes. And this is just
8	for clarification mostly I guess, because in the
9	thing that Charlie handed out yesterday in
10	the because I think we're getting confused
11	on the 1,500 number being MPAs or MMAs. And
12	according to this, those are marine managed areas
13	And when you look at the chart that he did in
14	the back, it's a much smaller number for MPAs
15	that would qualify according to the current thing
16	that's in the Federal Register. So is that
17	correct or not?
18	PARTICIPANT: No, that's the west
19	coast. We're only looking at the west coast
20	there.
21	MR. ZALES: Okay. So all 1,500 or
22	so would be candidates for MPAs?

1	PARTICIPANT: According to this, it's
2	1,641.
3	MR. ZALES: Then, I misunderstood.
4	DR. CHATWIN: They would be eligible
5	to be nominated. And that's a big difference,
6	because there might be reasons that the
7	nominating parties may not want to nominate
8	certain sites.
9	MR. ZALES: Well, yes, and then
10	that that gets into what's been heard I guess
11	for the history of this thing, too. And then,
12	like yesterday and today about what is the prize
13	for being nominated, what do you get for being
14	in the system. And it appears to me right now
15	the underlying prize would be money. And
16	obviously the MPA center is having to cut budgets
17	now, they can't even afford to put stuff in the
18	next ghost filing.
19	So, you know, that issue, along with
20	whatever else, I guess we need to figure out.
21	That's why I asked that question, is what they

would like to see. What do they get back for

getting an MPA?

DR. CHATWIN: And we're going to discuss that this afternoon.

CHAIR BROMLEY: Good. Jim Ray, and then Bob Bendick, and then Mark.

DR. RAY: During the lunch break I was having a discussion with George and Tundi outside, and I -- George made, you know, an interesting comment that, you know, a lot of these kinds of programs, we study them to death and spend 10 or 20 years planning before we ever do anything concrete.

And out of that comment, you know, the thought that came to my mind was that somewhere in the near future here, assuming that the development of an MPA system continues to go forward, you know, and it fits into your tiered discussion that we — that we've been talking about, is that maybe initially we don't try to fold all 1,500 or 2,000 in one great big swoop into an overall system.

We may get to a certain point in this

planning process where you've set enough of a structure as to -- of what's desired that you make a first pass in pulling some of your -- your -- high priority example, protected areas into this system of MPAs, and get the program started.

That gives you an opportunity to not only start to have the beginnings of a successful MPA system, but it also gives an opportunity to start building a response to that question of, what's the benefit of being part of that MPA system? So it's not quite the tier approach, but it's just another way to -- to approach it or think about it.

So, you know, we kind of banged that discussion around a little bit at lunch, and kind of thought it was worthwhile to throw it out here into this discussion, and so that the subcommittee could talk about it a little bit further today.

So that's just another approach to talk about.

NEAL R. GROSS

CHAIR BROMLEY: Okay. Bob Zales, did 1 2 you have any --MR. ZALES: No, I already --3 CHAIR BROMLEY: Oh, Bob Bendick. 4 MR. BENDICK: Yes. Following on, just, 5 you know, some things for Tony's subcommittee 6 7 maybe. First, I thought in a framework the one incentive that we talked about in our original 8 recommendations had to do with influence or 9 impact on federal actions. You know, would the 10 assistance of an MPA as part of the system be 11 an influence or affect a federal action that 12 13 affected that system? And the discussion of that in the 14 15 framework document I think is kind of vague. 16 And so I think it would be useful for the subcommittee to talk about how that could be 17 sharpened up, so that it would actually be an 18 19 incentive to become part of the system. Secondly, the issue of money. I mean, 20 all the case studies suggest that without money 21 you don't have this thing work. You don't have 22

a system work. You don't have incentives. So to take it as a given that we're not going to get any money makes -- doesn't make sense to me.

If money is a critical incentive for making this thing, or what you perceive to be a reasonable topic of discussion for your subcommittee, then we need to say that. And, you know, maybe we don't have a system if there's no money, but we shouldn't create a system -- the illusion of a system that can't work if there's no money.

And I suspect that a pretty small amount of money could go a long way. A couple of people have said that. For example, the research reserve system has a national estuarian research reserve system. It has a very small budget, but it has used that money very well to leverage all sorts of other money.

And, finally, the issue of representation. I do think that if the system doesn't somehow provide incentives for those critical places for marine productivity, for

NEAL R. GROSS

fishing, or to represent the diversity of marine
environments, if nothing is driving that, then,
again, you don't have a system. All you have
is a collection or an inventory.

And the -- one of the primary purposes
of the system was to actually have it functional
in terms of providing the ecological and human

and cultural benefits that were intended. And so I think thinking about what better incentives could be used to actually get representation

would be really useful.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIR BROMLEY: Thank you.

Mark Hixon?

DR. HIXON: The issue of funding is an 800-pound gorilla that occasionally jumps up and down on our backs, and it just keeps coming back, it just keeps coming back, it just keeps coming back.

And I was in D.C. last week at the National Science Foundation, and Leon Panetta spoke. He was chair of the Pugh Oceans Commission and now co-chair of the Joint Oceans Commission.

And one of the main messages he conveyed was, given the state of the United States right now, the only way to get funding is to fight for it.

And he was actually encouraging the National Science Foundation to fight for funding for marine-related research. And this may be taboo in this committee -- I don't know -- I may be completely politically incorrect. But funding is a key issue, and it's something we're going to have to grapple with at some level.

And if Mr. Panetta is right, we're going to have to fight for it somehow. So I want to put that on the table. I don't know the mechanisms, but no money, we're not going to get a whole lot done.

CHAIR BROMLEY: Bob?

MR. BENDICK: Well, if we can start by really being able to focus and express how money, at least a small amount of money, would leverage and be pivotal to creating what we want, to build a case for money not for a bunch of money for vague purposes, but specific money for

NEAL R. GROSS

1	specific purposes. That would be a start in
2	making the argument, and it seems appropriate
3	that we do that.
4	CHAIR BROMLEY: Yes, I would like
5	to I mean, we could talk about money forever.
6	So, Mark, and then I guess Gil, and then let's
7	DR. HIXON: What's not clear to me
8	is the exact mechanism. Mr. Panetta was saying
9	Congress must be stormed, and we have been
10	pounding on the doors of Congress for
11	CHAIR BROMLEY: There are good
12	reasons to storm it. You know, this one would
13	be about fourth on my list.
14	(Laughter.)
15	DR. HIXON: But, you know, it
16	basically says it's going to hit that level.
17	If you don't fight, you're not going to get it.
18	And he told a great joke. I've got
19	to tell this joke. I don't tell it as well as
20	he does. A priest and a rabbi went to a boxing
21	match, and one of the players made the sign of
22	the cross before entering the ring. And the rabbi

1 said to the priest, "What does that mean?" and 2 the priest said, "It doesn't mean a damn thing if you can't fight." 3 (Laughter.) 4 CHAIR BROMLEY: Gil, and then Mary. 5 MR. RADONSKI: You know, 6 we're 7 talking about incentives for going into the national system. As far as the fact -- MPA fact 8 here is concerned, it really doesn't matter. 9 10 We are charged by the Executive Order to tell them, "I'll set up a national system." 11 It isn't -- you know, once it goes 12 13 beyond that, we're into a different character. I agree with everybody, and the caution, you 14 know, what are the benefits -- we keep asking 15 16 that -- of coming into it? But for the time being, don't think that's our question. Our question 17 is how to go about doing it. That's what we're 18 19 supposed to be providing advice on. CHAIR BROMLEY: Okay. Thanks. Mary? 20 MS. GLACKIN: Αt the risk 21

further,

I

mentioned

22

prolonging this

the

subcommittee that I'm chairing, and one of the things that we've talked about, just kind of recently in this committee, is, you know, the -- under the ocean action plan we are developing a 10-year research plan, and that's out for comment and discussion. And that will clearly provide a blueprint of how we need to make science -- investments in science to move forward.

What we've talked about is we actually have nothing like that for resource management. You know, all we have is this collective set of everybody's problems. And on what basis could we come together to try to really articulate some national priorities for resource management? So more discussion at the bar.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR BROMLEY: Could I ask Tony a question? And it goes back to the tiering thing.

I think there is a sense that the term MPA covers a variety of things. Fair enough? I mean, there's MMAs and then there's MPAs. Would your tiering

NEAL R. GROSS

discussion get any traction by suggesting to us
different terminology for different degrees of

protection of ocean -- of marine habitats?

So that, I mean, this is a way to get around the crown jewel story, but it is a way -- as it is now, we have purposes. But I don't think we have in this matrix a set of clear signals to the public and to everybody else about what activities will and will not occur in certain places, and so on.

And I guess my question to you is:

does it help you -- would it help us -- would
you be willing to entertain -- if not, that's
fine -- the idea that the term MPA covers a variety
of stuff, a variety of things about allowed and
disallowed behavior. And if we had terminology
like park, reserve, sanctuary, blah, blah, blah,
that that would help people get a clear idea of
what we're talking about when we talk about a
particular kind of MPA with a particular purpose
in mind?

DR. CHATWIN: I think that could be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	a useful discussion, but I would say not at this
2	point in time.
3	CHAIR BROMLEY: Okay.
4	DR. CHATWIN: Because the whole
5	tiering discussion came from the desire to create
6	incentives for sites to of course, to evolve
7	to a national system, then to improve themselves,
8	and contribute more to the goals of the national
9	system. And so it was in that context.
10	If you now turn around and start
11	thinking, well, it's grouping different come
12	up with terms for grouping different MPAs, I think
13	that's a huge discussion that we need to have.
14	CHAIR BROMLEY: Okay. Dennis, and
15	then Tundi.
16	DR. HEINEMANN: I don't feel that
17	levels of protection were ever an element of the
18	tiers. Tiers were meant to represent somehow
19	some multi-dimensional measure of the quality
20	of an MPA in terms of meeting the objectives of
21	the national system.

CHAIR BROMLEY: Yes, okay.

	Tundi?
--	--------

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

DR. AGARDY: The categories -- the tiers were thought of in terms, as Dennis said, not in terms of level of protection, because we wanted to steer away from the idea that a no take reserve is somehow better than a multiple use reserve.

CHAIR BROMLEY: Precisely. It's just different, yes.

DR. AGARDY: But the idea categories of MPA was considered in the criteria in a kind of reverse way, a backwards way, from I think what you were implying, which is we want to -- we want to make sure that the MPA system represents many, many kinds of management, from the very small community-based or co-managed very large, what areas to the we would traditionally think of as the marine equivalent of a national park.

CHAIR BROMLEY: Right.

DR. AGARDY: So that criteria -- that criterion is in there for the tiering, but it

1	has to do with making sure that they're
2	representative types of management, so that we
3	don't focus solely on these big federally run
4	protected areas.
5	CHAIR BROMLEY: That's fine. Okay.
6	I guess John and Max.
7	DR. HALSEY: Well, as a
8	representative of a functioning system of MPAs,
9	I think it really depends on starting out with
10	what the purpose of that MPA is. I will admit,
11	we are dealing with probably the bottom end of
12	the scale. Our stuff is all dead. You know,
13	it's sitting there, but people still want to
14	exploit it in one way or another.
15	CHAIR BROMLEY: So are you protecting
16	ecosystems?
17	DR. HALSEY: No. No, no, we're not.
18	CHAIR BROMLEY: That's you know,
19	so you're not engaged in ecosystem-based
20	management?
21	DR. HALSEY: Not really.
22	CHAIR BROMLEY: You're protecting

artifacts.

DR. HALSEY: Protecting artifacts, right. But at this level of money which was never promised, and certainly has never been delivered, really hasn't been a -- it has been a problem, there's a lot of things that we would have liked to have done, but which we couldn't. But through involving people who did have a financial stake in these, namely the charter boat operators, and so forth, that is sort of our -- our level of infield management.

It's these people who are looking at these things, and they know that if this steering wheel disappears or this capstan or something like that, that degrades the quality of the experience that they can offer. And, therefore, they're going to lose money.

So that at that level, the sanctuary, the preserve, the MPA does have some meaning in that people can identify this particular agglomeration of wrecks as something valuable that they might have some fun or interest or even

excitement in visiting, photographing, and so forth.

In terms of time, we started in 1980 with this. And we always hoped that some day we would be able to have something that really sort of reached the level of a real MPA, a real preserve, where we had interpretation, where we had so forth, and that finally happened in 2000.

So I don't think 20 years is an unreasonable expectation for one of these things to go from just some guys who wanted to save wrecks to something that's now saving the town of El Pena and is really a full-time, really fleshed out, combination state and federal activity management system.

And I think we can be looked at as sort of at least one end, as I say on the dead end of resources, something that, you know, eventually does catch the public's attention and does really put a place on the map.

CHAIR BROMLEY: That's good. Okay, thanks.

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. PETERSON: I am from Missouri,
Mr. Chairman, and so let me suggest that most
of these MPAs are now in the hands of the states.
Okay. If you're Timbuktu state out there, I
don't see them lining up to nominate these areas
as fast as they can, without some understanding
of what the benefits are.

And so I think when we hand this off to somebody, it's probably going to befall the governors of the coastal states to decide whether they collectively want to do something about this. And, collectively, they could probably get some money. And, collectively, if one state does it, another state is likely to.

So I think we're sort of thinking, this business of moving them to where they are into this national system is sort of an analysis exercise, it's not an analysis exercise at all. It's ultimately a political exercise of what those states want to do, and ultimately, too, putting it in the national system is not going to change the management.

NEAL R. GROSS

If we say if we put it in the national system we're going to change the name and we're going to call them different things and continue to manage them, we're not going to get them, because the people that have them are not going to give up management.

So, and then, finally, we had not looked at the whole EEZ outside of state and territorial waters very much. I think that we ought to think about, as we round out a system of looking at areas that would make sense, out there in the EEZ where there's not a lot of conflicts now, where there's not a lot of uses, that we might be thinking about what kind of policy contributions do the MPAs make in that kind of situation.

I just thought this exercise is not simply running through some type of filtering and it comes out as an MPA. It's going to be whether the governor thinks that he or she as the governor and the political people think they want to put it in the system. And I don't see

NEAL R. GROSS

1	a lot of them just trying to pile them in, to
2	tell you the truth.
3	CHAIR BROMLEY: Okay. On that happy
4	note, why don't we into our groups. The classroom
5	is now available. Where is the classroom, Lauren?
6	Is it right here?
7	MS. WENZEL: It's next to the gift
8	shop.
9	CHAIR BROMLEY: Next to the gift shop.
LO	So two groups can stay here, and one group can
11	go to the classroom instead of the cafe. Or if
L2	one group likes the cafe, and the other one could
L3	go to the classroom, then one could work here.
L4	Is that right?
L5	MS. WENZEL: Yes.
L6	CHAIR BROMLEY: Okay.
L7	(Whereupon, the proceedings in the foregoing
L8	matter went off the record.)
L9	
20	
21	
, ,	

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701